A CRITICAL STUDY OF KOUNḌA BHAṬṬA'S

VAIYĀKARAṆABHŪṢAṆA SĀRA

by

Dr. Vanitha Ramaswamy

Rasa, Centre for Cultural Studies
A002, Adarsh Residency
47th Cross, 8th Block,
Jayanagar, Bangalore - 82

With Blessings
&
Best Compliments

V. Amith@Ramaswamy

1 विश्वविद्यालय का उद्देश्य मानवता, सहनशीलता, तर्कशीलता, चिन्तनप्रक्रिया की अभिवृद्धि, तथा सत्य की खोज में निरन्तर लगाना. लगाना है। मानव जाती का उच्चतमलक्ष्य
-जवाहरलाल नेहरू ।

, अध्यापन, अध्यापक, संस्कृत, अनुसंधान, त्रिभाषासूत्र ,

A Critical Study of Kounḍa Bhaṭṭa's Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇa Sāra

by

Dr. Vanitha Ramaswamy

Rasa, Centre for Cultural Studies
A002, Adarsh Residency
47th Cross, 8th Block,
Jayanagar, Bangalore - 82

A Critical Study of Kounḍa Bhaṭṭa's Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇa Sāra - by Dr. Vanitha Ramaswamy, A002, Adarsh Residency, 47th Cross, 8th Block, Jayanagar, Bangalore - 560 082 India Tel : 26530492

© author

Year of Publication : 2009

Price : Rs. 200/-

Printed by
Sri Rama Printers
25, 15th Cross
5th Main, Srinidhi Layout
Bangalore - 560 062

Preface

I have no words to adequately express my deep sense of gratitude to my beloved Guru Dr. (Smt.) Saroja Bhate, Retd. Professor and chairperson, P.G. Department of Sanskrit, University of Pune, who has written a splendid foreword to this book. She has occupied many positions of eminence even after her retirement. Presently she is the Director, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, and Secretary A.I.O.C., Pune.

Under the expert guidance of Dr. (Smt.) Saroja Bhate I got my doctorate on the topic - "Some concepts of Sanskrit Grammar and their application to computers". The thesis covers the first three chapters of Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra on धात्वर्थ, लकारार्थ and -सुबर्थ with English translation and critical study based on ancient Sanskrit commentaries.

Further the major UGC-Project that I undertook was a continuation of my thesis. As a result of my traditional background and also the guidance of experts of grammar in the traditional method I could work with confidence and complete the project in the year 2000.

The aim of the major UGC-research project was a critical study of the major grammatical works on semantics, namely Kouṇḍa Bhaṭṭa's Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra and Nāgeśa's Paramalaghumanjūṣā and the dissemination of the linguistic information for the purpose of computational linguistics.

The findings of this research work is planned to be brought out in three parts. This book is the first part which consists of "A critical study of Kouṇḍa Bhaṭṭa's Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra". The book contains sixteen chapters like dhātvartha, lakārārtha, subartha ----- upto sphoṭa nirṇaya.

It is a sad thing that this work had not received the necessary attention hither to by either traditional scholars or modern linguists. There is no complete translation or critical study of this book either in Kannada or English. A sincere effort has been put here to give all the information in the traditional style required for a thorough understanding of this great work. Hope this book will be useful for computer professionals in the field of Artificial Intelligence, modern linguists and those who wish to study the work in the traditional method.

I also wish to express my gratitude to the distinguished traditional scholars of Sanskrit grammar namely Vidwan Ranganatha Sharma, Vidwan Nagaraj for their guidance in the subject. I thank Prof. M. Gurushantha Swamy, M.S.C., Mysore for providing his class notes.

I shall be failing in my duty if I do not offer my collective thanks to all those authors from whose books I have freely drawn information.

I am grateful to my late father Vedaratnam. Sri. K. Venkata Subrahmanya avadhani, and my late uncle Sri. K. Krishna Śāstry, Prof. of vyākaraṇa, Chamarajendra Sanskrit College, Bangalore for their guidance, inspiration and blessings.

My thanks are also due to my son Mr. Avinash Karthik R. a software engineer who helped me in proof reading.

I thank Mr. Sathyanarayana of Sri Rama Printers for bringing out the book beautifully on time.

Vanitha Ramaswamy

Prof. of Sanskrit

Foreword

Intellectual tradition of India is marked with a sustained interest in language in all its aspects. Right from the Vedic age Indian mind engaged itself in the pursuit of understanding linguistic phenomenon. Amazed at its beauty of expression and power the vedic poets sung prayers in praise of the Goddess of speech. With sacrificial ritual at the centre of the ancient Indian culture, precision in every aspect related to sacrifice was the key word and since mantra occupied an important place in the ritual performance, careful study of language, particularly with reference to its pronunciation and composition was given utmost importance. Linguistics is, thus, the foremost science to have evolved out of the need to preserve and protect the sacred language.

Linguistic speculations continued outside the sacrificial culture and Pāṇini gifted the world with the foremost grammar of a spoken language the perfect grammar that could ever be written. Pāṇini was followed by a galaxy of great grammarians, Kātyayana, Patañjali, Bharthari, Kouṇḍa Bhaṭṭa and Nāgeśa to mention a few. A cursory glance at the Pāṇinian grammatical tradition as a whole reveals two way approach to language, study of word and study of meanings. While Pāṇini and his commentators primarily dealt with the sound and patterns of word-building leading to sentence structure, later grammarians, perhaps prompted and influenced by the contemporary developments in semantics in other disciplines such as Nyāya and Mīmāmsa, ruminated over different aspects of meaning and developed their own theories about the nature of meaning, sentence analysis and related issues. After centuries of debate with fellow-workers as well as rivals they arrived at a theory of sentence analysis which offered analysis of sentence-meaning to the utmost accuracy and precision.

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] प्रसाद:

Rick Briggs, the NASA scientist who came under the sway of the perfect semantic analysis laid down by erudite grammarians such as Kounḍa Bhaṭṭa and Nāgeśa wrote an article entitled "Artificial Intelligence and Knowledge Representation in Sanskrit" in 1985 and initiated dialogue among computer scientists and traditional Pandits. He showed striking correspondence between Śāstric Sanskrit and semantic nets used in A.I. Since then the issue has been taken up and is being studied at different institutes both, in India as well as outside.

The present book represents an attempt in the same direction, to explore fundamentals of traditional Indian semantics as laid down by stalwart grammarians. The attempt is aimed at application of the traditional Indian semantic elements to computer-aided language analysis. I congratulate Dr. Vanitha Ramaswamy for undertaking the ambitious project of providing guidelines to develop a core grammar of Indian languages for computer from a critical study of the major semantic works of Kounḍa Bhaṭṭa and Nāgeśa. I pay compliments to her also for having successfully accomplished the task. Since she is well-versed in both, traditional Sanskrit learning as well as information technology (A.I.), she has done proper justice to the subject. She is, in fact one of those rare scholars of today who combine eastern erudition with western scholarship. She has struck the right chord by establishing relevance of Sanskrit learning in the era of globalization. I am sure this book and its companion volumes in the series she proposes to publish in future will together set the model for future researchers in Orientology.

I wish her grand success in all her academic endeavours.

Dr. (Smt.) Saroja Bhate
Prof. of Sanskrit, Pune

CONTENTS

1. Preface
2. Foreword
3. Introduction ix
    - i. Life, Date and Works of Kounḍa Bhaṭṭa ix
    - ii. Brief history of Sanskrit grammar xi
    - iii. Predecessors of Pāṇini xii
    - iv. Pāṇini and Post-Pāṇinian grammarians xiii
    - v. Development of Pāṇinian system xv
    - vi. Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra xvi
    - vii Commentaries on the work xviii
4. Abbreviations xviii
5. Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra
    - 1. Benedictory Verse 1
    - 1. धात्वर्थनिर्णयः - The meaning of Verbal root 5
    - 2. लकारार्थनिर्णयः - The meaning of Lakārās 75
    - 3. सुबर्थनिर्णयः - The meaning of case endings 95
    - 4. नामार्थनिर्णयः - The meaning of nominal base 130
    - 5. समासशक्ति निर्णयः - The meaning of compounds 143
    - 6. शक्ति निर्णयः - The nature of power 167
    - 7. नञर्थ निर्णयः - The meanings of nañ 178

8. निपातार्थनिर्णयः - The meaning of nipātās 186

9. भावप्रत्ययार्थनिर्णयः - The meaning of the suffix tva etc. 202

10. देवताप्रत्ययार्थनिर्णयः - The meaning of the taddhitas 211

11. अभेदैकत्वसंख्यानिर्णयः - About number 216

12. संख्याविवक्षानिर्णयः - Discussion about number 220

13. क्त्वाद्यर्थनिर्णयः - The meaning of the suffix ktva etc. 224

14. स्फोटनिर्णयः - Discussion on the doctrine of sphoṭa 231

6. Bibilography 269

Introduction

Life, Date and works of Kounda Bhaṭṭa :

Kounḍa Bhaṭṭa is considered as the foremost of the pholosophers of Sanskrit grammar. His doctrine of grammar bridges the different theories of ancient and modern grammarians. He is said to be one of the scholar gems of Āndhrapradesh. He is profusely glorified by grammarians. The well known saying is that without studying his work called भूषणसार no one shall be entitled to be called a grammarian. Based on the information available up-to-date some details about his family, life, date and works are given below.

Kounḍa Bhaṭṭa belonged to Kāśyapa gotra and Bahvṛcha śākhā. His ancestors hailed from an agrahāra by name 'chārukūru', on the banks of Krishṇa river in Āndhrapradesh. His family name was cherukurivamśa. His grand-father was Laxmidhara who was a poet and a master of the science of Mīmāmsā. He was the court scholar of Tirumalarāya of Aravīdu dynasty of the kings of Vijayanagar (1570 -73 A.D.). This Laxmīdhara was a householder for a long time and became famous as "Ramānandāśrama' after taking to Sanyāsa.

Works of Laxmīdhara :

षड्भाषाचन्द्रिका, प्राकृतव्याकरणम्, अनर्घराघवनाटकस्य इष्टार्थकल्पवल्लरी व्याख्या, श्रुति रञ्जनी व्याख्या for गीतगोविन्दकाव्यम्, अभीष्टार्थ दायिनी - a commentary on Jayadeva's Prasannarāghava and a kāvya by name नलवर्णनकाव्यम्. He was a devotee of Lord Venkateśwara of Tirupathi.

Laxmidhara's family :

Laxmīdhara had two sons named Bhaṭṭoji Dīxita and Rangoji Bhaṭṭa. Bhattoji is the author of the famous work "Siddhānta Koumudī". In fact he made his family own Pāṇini. He not only mastered Pāṇini but also many other sciences. Bhaṭṭoji was the court scholar of king Keladi Venkatādri of Āndhra who was ruling Ikkeri (1582 - 1629 A.D.). Being encouraged by the king he composed a philosophical work in grammar by name - "Tattvakaustubha". He also composed number of other works.

Rangoji Bhaṭṭa :

Bhaṭṭoji's younger brother was Rangoji Bhaṭṭa who was also a greater scholar. Nṛsimhāśrami was the Vedānta Vidya guru of Rangoji. Rangoji also adored the court of Ḳeladivenkatādri, the king of Ikkeri. He composed two works titled "advaita cintāmaṇi" and advaitasāroddhāra.

In the year 1629 he won in argument against a मध्वयति by name vidyādhīśa vaderu for which he was honoured with the gift of a palanquin by the king of Ikkeri. He is said to have written a work called माध्वसिद्धान्तखण्डनम् . This Rangoji Bhaṭṭa was a devotee of कालहस्तीश्वर of Andrhapradesh. He has glorified his favourite deity in his poem called शिवोल्लासकाव्यम् ।

ग्रन्थे चास्मिन् तव विलसिते कालहस्तीश नित्यम् ।
कृत्वाभ्यासं भवति विजयी भक्ति भावैकनिष्ठः ।

Hence Rangoji's residence must have been near Kālahasti. He is guessed to have lived between 1540 - 1635 A.D.

Kounda Bhaṭṭa :

Kouṇḍa Bhaṭṭa was the son of Rangoji Bhaṭṭa. He must have lived during 1600 A.D. He studied under his uncle Bhaṭṭoji Dīxita. He was well versed in Vyākaraṇa, Nyāya, Mīmāmsa, advaita and other sciences. He had the honour of having established advaita siddhānta. His work on Grammar is also considered as a masterpiece of Advaita Vedānta. He recognises śabda Brahman as the only reality. His patron king was vīrabhadra the king of Keladi. Other details regarding his personal life are not known.

Works :

Kouṇḍa Bhaṭṭa has several works to his credit. (1) Tarkapradīpaḥ (2) Tarkaratnam (3) Bhūsaṇasāraḥ (4) Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāraḥ (5) Laghu vaiyākaraṇabhūsaṇasāraḥ (6) Padārthadīpikā (7) Vaiyākaraṇasiddhānta dīpikā (8) Sphoṭavāda.

Brief history of Sanskrit grammar

The science of grammar deals with padasamskāra or 'refinement of words' - व्याक्रियन्ते व्युत्पाद्यन्ते यस्मिन् तत् व्याकरणम् । It is called smṛti by Bhartṛhari - साधुत्वज्ञानविषया सैषा व्याकरणस्मृतिः (हरिकारिका). It is also a वेदाङ्ग-वेदाङ्गत्वेसति शब्दसाधुत्वबोधकत्वम् ।

References to the science of grammar have been found in the vedas. In the Brāhmaṇas we find words like वर्णः, वृषन् (पुल्लिङ्गः), वचनम्, विभक्तिः etc. The word व्याकरण occurs in the epic Rāmāyaṇa. But Pāṇini's ashṭādhyāyī is considered to be the first formal Sanskrit grammar ever written. Pāṇini refers to a number of names like Śākalya, Śākaṭāyana, Āpiśali, Sphoṭāyanā, and others. Pāṇini has stated- avaṅ sphoṭāyanasya. According to Haradatta, the author of padamanjari was the originator of the sphoṭa theory. Vyādi too was a teacher of the philosophy of Sanskrit grammar. Of the one lakh stanzas said to have been collected by him, 14,000 stanzas discussed about the subject says Bhaṛtrhari in his Mahābhāshyatīkā. On the basis of many of his evidences critics have opined that the science of grammar was well developed by the time of Pāṇini.

Yet all the grammarians before Pāṇini analysed mostly vedic words. Moreover some of the grammarians mentioned in these works are called by critics as śābdikās or those who only knew the use of right words and did not write any formal text on grammar. Thus the credit of not only writing a formal work on Sanskrit grammar but also dealing with both vedic and classical words goes to Pāṇini, the last grammarian of this group.

Predecessors of Pāṇini :

Broadly we see three distinct periods in the development of Sanskrit literature viz. the vedic, the Brāhmanic and the classical periods. The Brāhmaṇas with Āraṇyakas and upaniṣads form the last stage of vedic literature representing the middle period or middle Sanskrit. Yāska's nirukta is based on the languages of this period. Yāska too refers to many grammarians. The statements इन्द्रियनित्यं वचनमौदुम्बरायणः, 'सर्वाणि नामान्याख्यातजानि' इति शाकटायनः न सर्वाणि इति गार्ग्यः; and their classification of words into - नाम, आख्यात, उपसर्ग show the existence of the science of grammar long before Yāska.

This classification of words is found in the prātishākhya of

Śaunaka also. Further statements like - सत्त्वप्रधानानि नामानि, क्रियाप्रधानानि धातुः, the nature of upasargas and nipātas, the division of pratyayas into krit and taddhita were known before. Reference is made to nine kinds of grammar like aindra, Chandra kāshakritsna, śākaṭayana etc. None of these is available now. The ninth is said to be Pāṇini's Ashṭādhyāyī.

Pāṇini and post Pāṇinian grammarians :

Unlike his predecessors, Pāṇini has derived both vedic and classical words. His work was based on the spoken Sanskrit language of his period. His principal aim was to provide word analysis. His kāraka system describes sentence analysis also. He gave importance to laukikaśabdas or usage. Hence people must have welcomed and accepted his work. As a result other grammatical works might have lost importance.

The first commentator of Pāṇini on record was Kātyāyana. His work is second in antiquity among works fully preserved. Kātyāyana did not mean to justify the rules of Pāṇini. With his explanations in the form of vārtikas he found fault with them. For example in the rule 'gotoṇit' he found the fault of avyāpti as the ṇit pratyaya had to set in on all ओ-kārāntha words and not only on go śabda. He wrote the vārtika- 'ओतोणित्'. He kept silent on those which did not need any correction.

But critics are of the opinion that the grammatical forms that were used during the time of Pāṇini changed their forms in usage by the time of Kātyāyana. For example, एकतरम्-एकतरत्, चिद्भ्यां-चिन्मयम्, दरिद्रौ-दरिद्राश्चकार, चचकश-चकशम् चकार etc. Not merely in grammatical forms but in meaning also.

आश्चर्यमनित्ये (सूत्र) अद्भुते इति वक्तव्यम् (वार्ति)
भोज्यं भक्ष्ये (सूत्र) भोज्यमभ्यवहार्ये इति वक्तव्यम् (वा)

Some words used during the sūtra period had become obsolete during the period of vārtikas. For ex. प्रत्यवसान in भक्षणार्थ, ऋषि in वेदार्थ, शालिनीकरण in सम्मानार्थ . These were the meanings during the sūtra period. A large number of words had become antiquated and a literature unknown to Pāṇini had appeared.

Patañjali who came later was a staunch devotee of Pāṇini. He could not stand the way Kātyāyana had treated him. So he wrote his Mahābhāshya both on the vārtikas and independently on the sūtras. Thus he dispensed with many vārtikas.

The main aim of grammar was to explain the sādhutva and asādhutva of words. This was done in two ways. One was the प्रक्रियामार्ग and the other was the पदपदार्थः तत्सामर्थ्यः etc. Though Pāṇini followed mainly the prakriyāmārga (derivative method), he was aware of the importance of the meaning of words. Pāṇini has stated 'अवङ्स्फोटायनस्य'. Sphoṭa is the idea or the meaning which flashes on the mind when a word is uttered. The philosophy of grammar or vyākaraṇadarśana is very old. Yāska has stated, 'इन्द्रियनित्यं ... etc. Yet the science of semantics formally originated with Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya. Patañjali discussed topics of philosophical interest than the mere explanation of right words.

Later important semantic treatises on Sanskrit grammar:

1. Bhartṛhari's vākyapadīyam
2. Bhattoji Dixita's śabdakaustubha and the kārikās.

3. Koundabhaṭṭa's vaiyākaraṇabhūshaṇasāra.
4. Nāgeśabhaṭṭa's paramalaghumanjūṣā

Bhartṛhari's vākyapadīya (500 A.D.) based on the Mahābhāshya is the earliest philosophical grammar in Sanskrit available to us. The book contains three chapters namely brahmakānda, padakānda and prakīrṇakānda.

From Bhartṛhari upto the time of Bhaṭṭoji Dīxita for about 1200 years, vākyapadīya was the only authentic work or prakaraṇagrantha in this field. Bhattoji's śabdakaustubha based on the principles of Mahābhāshya is a commentary on the ashtādhyāyī. Though the work is not available in full, evidences show that he has completed the work. He does not discuss about the derivation of words. In order to emphasise the philosophical implications he wrote a kārikā grantha, comprising seventy four kārīkas. Some of the kārikās in this are from earlier grammatical works. When Kouṇḍa Bhaṭṭa wrote his vaiyakāraṇabhūṣaṇasāra Bhaṭṭoji is said to have been alive.

Development of Pāṇinian system :

Pāṇini's work was the object of two types of commentaries, one followed the order of the sūtra as found in the ashṭādhyāyī, the other recognised them under major topics like sañjñā, paribhāṣā etc. Bhaṭṭoji is the pioneer in the latter type.

The aim of grammar was to explain the sādhutva of words. The awareness of śabdasādhutva comes in two ways. One due to पदविभाजन by the method of लोप, आगम, आदेश etc. the other by अर्थसंधान. Works like काशिका, प्रक्रियाकौमुदी and सिद्धान्तकौमुदी tell us about शब्दसाधुत्व. The second method deliberates on the meaning of प्रकृति, प्रत्यय etc. and tries to establish the vaiyākaraṇasiddhānta or doctrine of the grammarians.

Bhaṭṭoji must have thought that the अर्थज्ञान was as important as the प्रक्रियाज्ञान. He wrote the kārikās based on Mahābhāṣya, the first work on semantics. To make the meaning of these Kārikās more clear, Kounḍa Bhaṭṭa wrote Vaiyākaraṇabhūshaṇa and later brought out its essence in Vaiyākaraṇabhūshaṇasāra.

Vaiyākaraṇabhūshaṇasāra :

It is a well known work in the tradition of Sanskrit grammar. It is a commentary on the seventy four kārikās of Bhaṭṭoji Dīxita. The kārikās are based on Dīxita's own earlier work called śabdakaustubha, which puts forth the theories on the philosophy of grammar. These theories are based on the Mahābhāsya of Patañjali. As the Vaiyākaraṇabhūshaṇasāra is a commentary on these kārikās, it is also a work on the philosophy of grammar. Hence the discussions are not on the rūpaprakriyā of śabdas or words but on the meanings. The work is an excellent exposition of the subject. For ex. The explanation of tasmāt in 'tasmāt karotirdhātoḥ syāt' (ka-8) shows the depth of his understanding. He has not only softened the differences between the ancient and modern schools of grammar but has tried to correlate the doctrines of various schools of Indian philosophy on grammar like the Nyāya, Mīmīmsā and vedānta etc., by minimising the differences. For this reason he is regarded with great respect by scholars of other schools also. His work is a commentary on the kārikās of Bhaṭṭoji who was Kounḍa Bhaṭṭa's uncle as well as preceptor.

Hence the book gains greater importance as it certainly helps us in the genuine understanding of Bhaṭṭoji Dīxita.

Commentaries on the work :

(1) Darpaṇa-Harivallabha,
(2) Parīkshā-Bhairavamiśra,
(3) Vivṛti-Rudranātha,
(4) Bhūshaṇa-Krishṇamitra,
(5) Prabhā-Bālakrishna Śāstri Pañcoli,
(6) Śānkarī-Śankara Śāstry,
(7) Saralā-Gopāla Śāstry,
(8) Subodhinī-Rāmaprasāda tripāti,
(9) Kānti Manudeva,
(10) Vaiyākaraṇamatonmajjini-Vanamāli Mishra,
(11) Laghubhūshaṇakānthi-Gopāladeva, (not available in full),
(12) Kāśikā-Harirāma (not available),
(13) Tattvadarṣinī:-Perisūryaṇārāyaṇa Śāstry.

List of Abbreviations

Aṣhṭādhyāyi - Aṣhṭ.
Bhattoji Dixita - B.
Bhartrhari - Bh.
Brihatbhūṣaṇa - Br.bh.
Commentary - Comm.
Darpaṇa - Dar.
Grammarian - Gn.
Kounḍa Bhaṭṭa - K.Bh.K.
Mahābhāṣya - M.Bh.
Mīmāmsa - M
Mīmāmsaka - Mk
Motilal Banarasi Das - M.B.D.
Naiyāyika - N
Nyāya - N
Nyāyakusumānjali - N.kus.
Parīkṣā - Par.
Paramalaghumanjūṣā - p.l.m.
Ramakrisṇamācāryulu - R.K.
Saralā - Sar.
Sānkhyā - S

Subodhinī	-	Sub.
Tatvadarśinī	-	Tat.dar.
Vākyapadīya	-	V.P.
Vaiyākaraṇa Bhūṣaṇasāra	-	V.Bh.
Vaiśeṣika	-	Va.
Vārtika	-	Var.
Vyākaraṇa	-	V.
Artificial Intelligence	-	AI

वैयाकरणभूषणसारः

श्री लक्ष्मीरमणं नौमि गौरिरमणरूपिणम् ।
स्फोटरूपं यतः सर्वं जगदेतत्विवर्तते ॥

The grammarians accept 'स्फोटरूपं' as Brahma. To indicate this, the word 'स्फोटरूपं' is used in the benedictory verse of Dixita's Kārikās. Sphoṭa is expressive of meaning- स्फुटति अर्थः अस्मात्. As meaning is conveyed through words, sphoṭa is of the form of word. रूप्यते बोध्यते इति रूपमर्थः । The word sphoṭa conveys the sense of the word which is of the form of नाम (शब्द) and रूप (अर्थ). The Śruti नामरूपे व्याकरणवाणी supports this meaning.

हरिहरयोरभेद प्रतिपादनायाह गौरीरमणेति । स्फुटत्यर्थोऽस्मादिति स्फोटः शब्दः । रूप्यते बोध्यते इति रूपमर्थः । स्फोटश्च रूपं चानयोः समाहारः स्फोटरूपं तादृशं जगत् । or sound is the symbol and अर्थ is its sense. शब्द - word and अर्थ sense together represent this world, which appears in the form of विवर्त. The Indian philosophical texts explain the word विवर्त as- अतात्त्विकान्यथाभावाश्रयो भवति, इत्यर्थः । अपरित्यक्तपूर्वरूपस्य रूपान्तरप्रकारक प्रतीतिविषय इति यावत् ।

तात्त्विकः अन्यथाभावः परिणामः ~~अतात्त्विकः~~ (like milk changing into curds). अतात्त्विकः अन्यथा भावः विवर्तः । अन्यथाभावः means भ्रमा or illusion. विवर्त means, any object which appears different without really changing. To think a rope as a snake, a shell as silver is vivartha.

In keeping with the convention Dixita's work commences with a benedictory verse.

अशेषफलदातारं भवाब्धितरणे तरिम् ।
शेषाऽशेषार्थलाभार्थं प्रार्थये शेषभूषणम् ।

अशेषफलदातारं-शेषषष्ट्या समासः । भवः संसारोऽब्धिरिव तस्य तरणं नाशस्तस्मिन् । तरिं नौकाम् साधनमिति यावत् । 'तरतिशोकमात्मवित्' इति श्रुतेः ।

Bhaṭṭoji has offered his salutations to both Śiva and Viṣṇu for a thorough knowledge of the Mahābhāshya composed by Patañjali.

फणिभाषित भाष्याब्धेः शब्दकौस्तुभ उद्धृतः ।
तत्र निर्णीत एवार्थः संक्षेपेणेहकथ्यते ॥

Patañjali is considered as an incarnation of ādiśeṣa. शब्दकौस्तुभ is a work based on Patañjali's M.Bh. The subject matter of the 74-kārikās of Dīxita is based on his own work called शब्दकौस्तुभ.

पाणिन्यादि ... दूषये - Kaunḍa Bhaṭṭa offers salutations to the मुनित्रय and his father Rangoji Bhaṭṭa, whom he describes as goddess Saraswati herself incarnate as पुरुष, capable of destroying the darkness of dvaita. Next he salutes Ganesha and declares that he is going to refute the doctrine of grammar polluted by the words of the wrong interpreters of Gautama and Jaimini.

Gautama, the son of Brahma, born in the Gautama Gotra, composed the Nyāya sūtras. Jaimini, the disciple of Vedavyāsa composed the Mīmāmsā sūtras. Tarka Vātsyāyana wrote the Nyāyasutra Bhāṣya. Then followed the ancient NKs, the new NKs and many commentators. Śabara Swamy wrote the Bhāṣya for Mīmāmsaka sūtras. Kamārila Bhaṭṭa, Prābhākara and others followed this school.

K.Bh. has expressed his respect in these sciences by saying, that there is no difference between the ideas of Jaimini and the ideas of मुनित्रय. But due to faulty commentators (अपव्याख्यानकारs) the difference is seen. Hence he is going to refute them (विरोधाभावः ध्वनित इति बोध्यम्).

द्वैत means द्वे इतः आश्रयत्वेन प्राप्तः द्वैतः - भेदः तस्य इदं ज्ञानं द्वैतं अथवा द्वाभ्यां प्रकाराभ्यां इतः द्वैतः i.e. जीव and जड. The जगत् is जड, जीव is अजड. तत्र भवं द्वैतं पुमान् भावः (आकाररूपः) यस्या सा - पुंभावः (पुरुषाकृतिः), पुंभावाचासौ वाग्देवता च पुंभाव वागदेवता. This is an adjective to पितरं, though of a different gender. By the rule -अजहल्लिङ्गत्वात् स्त्रीप्रधानम् it becomes an adjective being on the same substratum. The last āchārya, whose work is an authentic source for the science of grammar is Patañjali. (यथोत्तरं मुनीनां प्रामाण्यम्). Hence very auspicious.

The अनुबन्धचतुष्टयs are वैयाकरणसिद्धान्तो विषयः the doctrine presented in the Mahābhāṣya is the subject. (2) तज्ज्ञानस्य प्रयोजनत्वम् - The purpose is to attain that knowledge. (3) सम्बन्धः - प्रतिपाद्यप्रतिपादकभावः सम्बन्धः - For siddhānta granthas the relation is प्रतिपाद्य - प्रतिपादकभावः (4) तज्जिज्ञासूनामधिकारत्वम् - Those who wish to acquire this knowledge are the qualified candidates. Kounḍa Bhaṭṭa writes शिष्यशिक्षार्थं मङ्गळम् ।

भाष्याब्धेः उद्धृतः means, it is not an imaginary theory. The doctrines established in the Mahābhāṣya have been discussed. शब्दकौस्तुभ by Bhaṭṭoji Dixita is a detailed work on Pāṇini's work, based on the doctrine of the M. Bh. It is stated in the शब्दकौस्तुभ that फणिभाषित भाष्याब्धेशब्दकौस्तुभमुद्धरे । The essence of this work is briefly presented in the कारिकाग्रन्थ. V.Bh.Sāra is a commentary on these seventy four kārikās of Dixita. The work commences with the chapter on धात्वर्थनिर्णय।

Well, Vākya or sentence is responsible for both action and inaction in the world. Hence by the expression. वाक्यस्फोटो अत निष्कर्षः, वाक्यस्फोट has been approved as the doctrine of grammarians. The bhāṣya in the पस्पशान्हिक writes अनभ्युपाय विशेषशब्दानां प्रतिपत्तौ प्रतिपदपाठः - Hence, the division of vākya of words, and of words into letters, (base and suffix etc.) have been accepted. By the method of अन्वय-व्यतिरेक the meaning of प्रकृति-प्रत्यय is made out. अन्वय is यत्सत्वे यत्सत्वं, व्यतिरेक is यदभावे यदभावः. Bhartṛhari writes - असत्ये वर्त्मनि स्थित्वा ततः सत्यं समीहते. Though this kind of division is not real, it helps to arrive at the right form of words or साधुशब्दs. वर्णस्फोट and पदस्फोट are created to gain the knowledge of the real vākyasphoṭa.

A vākya is a group of सुबन्तs and तिङन्तs. According to the rule एकतिङ् वाक्यम्, the meaning of one verb being important leads to - शाब्दबोध or verbal knowledge. In view of the total meaning, तिङन्तार्थ is important. In तिङन्तः, the meaning of the verbal root is even more important than the meaning of तिङ्. Hence Dīxita deals with धात्वर्थ which is प्रधान. The Nirukta states - सर्वाणि आख्यातजानि, and even the M.Bh. writes नाम च धातुमाह निरुक्ते, व्याकरणे शकटस्य च तोकं" (3.3.1), thus धात्वर्थ is प्रधान in वाक्यजन्यबोध - the knowledge coming from a sentence' and hence धात्वर्थ is dealt with first.

धात्वर्थनिर्णयः

The meaning of the Verbal Root

In accordance with his pledge in the beginning K. deliberates on the views of the न्याय, the मीमांसा and the वैय्याकरण schools on the meanings of धातु, लकार etc. With due reasons he refutes the - न्याय and the मीमांसा schools and establishes the views of the grammarians ultimately.

The meaning of the verbal root being the focal point in the understanding of a sentence K deals with the same in the first chapter.

To overcome the difficulty of concordance the word स्मृतः is substituted for स्मृताः by विपरिणाम 'change,' which means 'अन्वययोग्यविभक्ति वचनकल्पना एव' - 'to imagine a suitable number and case ending for the purpose of concordance.' The usage like वेदाः प्रमाणम् is an exception, as it only implies the verbal testimony of the vedas in general. Therefore the sense of the कारिका would be फलव्यापारयोर्धातुः स्मृतः । फलाश्रये व्यापाराश्रये च तिङ् स्मृतः । फले व्यापारः प्रधानम्, शाब्दबोधे तिङर्थः विशेषणम् । फलव्यापारयोः अनुकूलत्वम् संसर्गः ।

'The verbal root is used in the sense of fruit and action. The verbal suffixes in the sense of कर्तृ and कर्मन्. Action is important in the fruit. The meaning of the verbal suffix is a qualifier in verbal cognition. The relation between fruit and action is one of 'being favourable.' That is action conducive to the fruit.

This analysis is in pursuance of the principle that 'action is the most prominent qualificand of knowledge.'

If the meaning of धातु is fruit then there is over application in action which is also the meaning of धातु and vice versa.

This objection does not stand as the definition of fruit according to K would be : 'धातुवाच्यत्वेसति धातुवाच्यव्यापार जन्यत्वमेवफलम्''

"Being the meaning of धातु and resulting from such activity which is also the meaning of धातु' !

The commentary says- तद्धात्वर्थजन्यत्वेसति तद्धातुजन्यउपस्थितीय - विषयाश्रयत्वम् फलत्वम्, 'The state of being the fruit is the state of being the substratum of the cognition of the subject born of that धातु and having been born of the sense of that धातु'

Objection by the neo-school of grammarians- By using the dual number as फलव्यापारयोः, fruit and action are shown as two separate meanings of धातु. Then it has two powers. In that case the two meanings have to be related by उद्देश्यविधेयभाव (the notion of the principal and the subordinate). This results in two limiters of power which have to be related as cause and effect. Hence, it leads to prolixity. Therefore the two meanings fruit and action as a composite whole should be accepted. Like फलावच्छिन्नव्यापारे, व्यापारवच्छिन्नफलेशक्तिः. The power of a धातु is in action limited by the fruit, or fruit limited by action.' Of them only one is to be understood as required in active and passive usage.

The objection is countered as follows- If so, as per the maxim पदार्थः पदार्थेन अन्वेति न तु पदार्थैकदेशेन - 'The meaning of a word agrees with the whole entity and not with a part, the fault of एकदेशान्वय 'agreement with only a part of the meaning, occurs. In the sentence

-देवदत्तः तण्डुलं पचति the fruit of the root पच् is 'softening.' Then the substratum of softening is rice. So, rice concords with the fruit-'softening' which is a part of the meaning of the root पच् and action is left out.

In the case of घटः, घटत्व is the एकदेश or part of घट. Here with a view to have नित्यत्वान्वय - "agreement with the state of eternity' there is no usage as नित्यः घटः । But the statement घटत्वम् नित्यम् is accepted.

Therefore to avoid this fault K accepts the meanings fruit and action like two fruits supported by the same stalk-एकवृन्तावलम्बिफलद्वयवत् which are drawn as required in active or passive usage. The commentary refers to the technical meaning of the word फल, fruit is generally understood as the aim of any activity. According to the rule स्वरितञितः कर्त्रभिप्रायेक्रियाफले (p.1.3.72) the aim of performing a sacrifice is to attain heaven.

Similarly, appeasement of hunger is the result of cooking. But such a familiar meaning cannot be taken here. Because if appeasement of hunger does not take place; the sentence देवदत्तो अपाक्षीत् cannot be used. Hence, the meaning of the word फल should be technical or पारिभाषिक in this शास्त्र. Thus K writes विक्लित्ति or softening of rice as the result of the root पच्. Now action is explained. According to K, activity presented as a process is called व्यापार. The process is expressed by the intervening actions, such as lighting the stove, keeping the vessel on it etc.

Though the words अनाकांक्षा and आकांक्षा are intended to apply to पचति and पाकः respectively, yet in the text first आकांक्षा

and then अनाकांक्षा is used, according to the rule अल्पाच्तरम् (p.2.2.34) 'a word with a fewer vowels comes first in a compound.

The commentary refers to an objection by the MKs regarding the meaning of व्यापार . If the root पच् is an expression of all the intervening actions, then it will have several meanings like the word हरिः which means विष्णुः, अश्वः etc.

According to K, even the words तद्, इदम्, etc. show many objects like सः, अश्वः, सा लता, तत्फलम् etc. Yet there is only one special meaning for all of them.

The commentary writes that in the case of पचति the knowledge of such details is gained by experience. According to the तदादिन्याय and also due to the special capacity of the mind the unity of the intervening actions is grasped. The root पच् does not have several meanings. The intervening actions result in a special awareness, like many flowers in a garland. The commentary states that- तदादिन्यायेनेति यथा स घट इत्युक्ते बुद्धिस्थो घट इत्यर्थः प्रतीयते, तत्र बुद्धिस्थत्वम् घटेऽपि, घटत्वेऽपि । (Sub.)

Now K assumes another objection as follows- All actions cannot be seen simultaneously. The intervening actions are momentary. In view of the later actions the earlier ones do not exist. Then how can they be called action?

To clear this objection the expression बुद्धिप्रकल्पितभेधाः 'mentally conceived as one' is used.

K assumes another doubt and replies-

If action is a collection of parts, the word पचति cannot be used in the beginning at the time of placing the vessel on the stove.

This is answered by saying that the whole is imposed on every part. तदभाववतितत्प्रकारकं ज्ञानम्. It is clear from the V.P. which states-

'That attains sequence through the earlier and later parts and the non-present (असद्) action being super imposed on it, it can also be expressed by the verbs.

Though the verb is said to imply only one 'क्रिया' 'action,' yet the special capacity of the mind can put all actions together. Therefore व्यापार 'action' is defined as-

तद्धात्वर्थ फलजनकत्वे सति तद्धातुवाचित्वम् 'being the meaning of धातु and producing the result which is also the meaning of धातु.

According to the grammarians the सिद्धक्रिया - 'action completed' and साध्यक्रिया 'action in the process of completion' are distinguished as follows: पाकः shows action that is completed. - सिद्ध क्रिया is expressed by a noun or thing. Hence the semantic expectancy does not rest till a verb is heard. In पाकः the process of action is veiled by the primary suffix घञ्. In this form it takes gender and number like a substance as- ओदनस्य पाकः, पाकः जायते,पाकेन कार्यं सिद्ध्यति etc.

In पचति or साध्यक्रिया actions in the process of accomplishment are latent. There is no gender and number for such actions. There is no semantic expectancy for another action in the mind of a person after hearing पचति, करोति etc. There is the expectancy of only कारकाs like who, what etc. The forms like पचति पचतः पचन्ति take the number after the agent. As action does not exist it is beyond the purview of number. Hence in impersonal voice singular number is used.

Thus सिद्ध and साध्य क्रियाs are distinguished.

As per the text आश्रये तु तिङः स्मृताः - the verbal suffixes are used in the sense of substratum. This is explained as फलाश्रयकर्मनिष्ठवाच्यतानिरूपित वाचकता, व्यापाराश्रयकर्तृनिष्ठ वाच्यतानिरूपित वाचकतातिङ्प्रत्ययनिष्ठा.

'The verbal suffix is the expression for कर्तृ and कर्मन् being the substrata of action and fruit respectively.'

According to K fruit and action are the meanings of the verbal root. It is not right to attribute the same to the verbal suffix also. The maxim अनन्यलभ्यो हि शब्दार्थः says- 'The meaning of a word is that which is not obtained by any other source.'

It is stated under सुबर्थनिर्णय that the state of being the 'substratum itself' is power. The sense implied by power is शक्यार्थ. But this is present in both घट and पट. Then घट may mean पट and vice versa. To avoid this fault it is necessary to accept शक्यतावच्छेदकधर्म i.e. घटत्व 'potness,' 'clothness' etc. If the verbal suffix is directly stated as the expression for the agent and the object powers being many it leads to prolixity. If the primary meaning of the verbal suffix is the substratum then the limiter of power would be the state of being the substratum which is conducive to brevity.

Refers to the objection by the MKs, as follows-

According to K there is a clear reference to the agent in पचति etc. and to the object (कर्मन्) in पच्यते, पठ्यते etc. The MKs object saying that this kind of reasoning is not acceptable as the senses of the agent and the object are available by three other ways also.

(i) Firstly, by secondary means. For example in गंगायां घोषः the meaning of गंगा is flood. But by secondary means the sense of the bank is given. Hence here also the actual meaning of the verbal suffix being भावना, the sense of the agent and the object is obtained by secondary means.

According to K, this view is untenable because two वृत्तिs cannot operate simultaneously. Moreover भावना becomes unimportant in verbal cognition.

Secondly by अर्थापत्ति or presumption - which means येन विना तदनुपपन्नं तत् तेन कल्प्यते यथा पीनोऽयं देवदतः. Here by अर्थापत्ति the 'night meal' is presumed. Similarly in भवति etc. the meaning of the verbal suffix is not clear without the agent and the object. Obviously it is presumed. भावना is in the form of effort which is the quality of the self.

According to K, this view is also untenable, as, though the presumed कर्तृ is seen, he becomes only a qualifier. Otherwise भावना becomes unimportant in verbal cognition.

The MKs consider अर्थापत्ति as an independent proof of valid knowledge, whereas the NKs bring it under inference.

As of the NKs, without the knowledge of व्याप्ति or concomitance there is the comprehension of the substratum. Hence inference is not applicable.

Thirdly, by the first case ending word - In sentences like चैत्रः पचति etc, the word चैत्र along with पचति shows the कर्तृ. This is refuted later in detail.

Now K refutes the arguments of the MKs conclusively. The rule लः कर्मणि (p.3.4.69) is a proof by itself in giving the meaning of the agent and he object for the verbal suffix. By the presence of two चकारs and by the earlier rule कर्तरिकृत् (p.3.4.67) the अनुवृत्ति of कर्तरि is extended twice. Then the meaning of the rule would be that the tense affixes (लकाराः) indicate the agent and the object in the case of transitive verbs and in the case of intransitive verbs they denote the action as well as the agent.

According to K, in the rule लः कर्मणि (p.3.4.69) though the meanings of 'the agent and the object' are given to the tense affixes (लकाराः) only, in practice the meanings are gained by verbal suffixes being the substitutes for लकारs.

Similarly in रामन् there is the sense of कर्मन् for न. But first it is ordained on शस् and then by स्थानिवद्भाव "like the original' न् gets the sense of कर्मन्. In रामैः the विसर्ग itself shows the sense of the instrument. But in grammar, first the करणार्थ is shown for भिस् then by स्थानिवद्भाव 'treated like the one for which it is substituted' it gains visarga.

Similarly though the verbal suffix has the sense of the 'agent and the object,' for derivational convenience first these senses are given to the tense affixes (लकाराः) and then to the verbal suffixes.

The reason for such techniques being adopted in the Science of grammar, is explained by Bharthari as follows :-

उपायाः शिक्षमाणानाम् बालानाम् उपलालनाः ।
असत्ये वर्त्मनि स्थित्वा ततः सत्यम् समीहते ॥
उपेय प्रतिपात्यर्था उपाया अव्यवस्थिताः ।

'The means of teaching the (right forms) are like the children's play standing in the false path first, then seeing the truth. The means to know the required forms are not regularised.'

Grammatical derivation is like children's play a 'fiction.' Not real. The grammarian takes resort to the false path to know the ultimate reality. Each grammarian has followed his own method. Some have said सुप् affix, some other सिम् affix. पाणिनि has called इत् suffix in पठितम्. पतञ्जलि says it is त-प्रत्यय and instead of तावत् gives वतुप् and so on. Though the method of conveying these is not the same, yet by these means the well-known vedic and worldly usages have been established.

According to the MKs, if the suffix is expressive of action, then even the कृत् suffixes cannot express the sense of the agent and the object.

The commentary explains clearly this view of K as follows- The word कर्तरि in the rule कर्तरिकृत् (p.3.4.4) extends to लः कर्मणि (p.3.4.69). Hence it is right to give the same meaning for the word कर्तरि in both places. This is the meaning implied by the expression . तुल्ययोगक्षेमं . अलब्धस्यलाभः योगः । 'योग' is to gain a new meaning. लब्धस्य परिरक्षणं to maintain what is gained' is क्षेमम्.

According to K, in sentences like पाचकः देवदत्तः as the words are standing in apposition to each other the word कर्तरि gains the sense of the substratum. Then as the same word कर्तरि is extended to the rule लः कर्मणि, the same meaning should be accepted. There is no proof in the argument that in the case of लःकर्मणि it is the sense is based on the qualifier while in कर्तरिकृत् on the qualified.

The MKs argue as follows- The governing principle in these rules is of two kinds. One governed by mere word and the other governed by mere sense. The MKs argue that in the rule लः कर्मणि it is शब्दाधिकार. Hence the governing word कर्तरि has the sense of the state of being the agent. In कर्तरिकृत् it is the अर्थाधिकार, hence कर्तरि has the sense of being the substratum. Therefore there is nothing wrong here.

The above argument is countered as follows :

If शब्दाधिकार is accepted then it is obvious that the same word कर्तरि present in both the rules would be responsible for two different senses. This certainly leads to prolixity.

If अर्थाधिकार is accepted then as the same meaning applies to both it is easy for the purpose of concordance and also brief.

Now K offers another solution as अपि च .... Just as in the case of कृत् let the MKs accept the verbal suffix as the expression for the agent and the object. Then action may be understood by presumption.

But the MKs object for this and say that in words like पाचकः etc, there is no importance for the action indicated by presumption. In the case of verbal suffixes action shows itself as important. Hence, it is not possible to accept भावना through आक्षेप in verbal suffixes.

Now K shows another reason for his suggestion - The commentary explains this as follows -

The MKs believe in the theory of the universal. They take resort to आक्षेप to denote the individual. In the sentence घटमानय it is not possible to bring the meaning of the verbal root. Similarly even in the case of इतरेतरद्वन्द्व compound like धवश्च खदिरश्च धवरखदिरौ the united meaning is expressed by the two चकाराs. But there is no special word to convey the united meaning. Therefore in पाकं करोति the explanation showing the agent as important is not based on -पचति but on the purport. [illegible]

The VKs say- The above reasoning may be set aside in the same way. Therefore explanations are according to one's verbal capacity. It is not possible to arrive at a decision.

In the sentence पचति देवदत्तः the presence of the non-differentiated concordance is obviously seen. As when someone else is cooking, the sentence देवदत्तः पचति is not made. Thus the verbal suffix shows कर्तृ.

The MKs. argue- Non-differentiated concordance is seen in examples like नीलः घठः, कृष्णः कम्बलः where similar case endings are present. In the sentence देवदत्तः पचति the question of non-differentiated agreement does not arise at all.

The VKs reply- Well, if non-differentiated concordance exists only where similar case endings are seen then in सोमेन यजेत, स्तोकं पचति and राजपुरुषः there will not be any अभेदान्वय. But according to the MKs, non differentiated agreement is established in these cases.

In the sentence सोमेन यजेत, the word यजेत means यागेन भावयेत्. Here the MKs give the meaning of सोमवता for सोमेन by secondary means and achieve non-differentiated concordance with याग, the sense of the verbal root and accept the cognition asसोमवता यागेन इष्टं (स्वर्गादि) भावयेदिति. Where is 'similar case endings' here?

In स्तोकं पचति there is non-differentiated agreement of स्तोक, the verbal adjective with the result in the form of softening which is the meaning of the root पच्. In राजपुरुषः also, the word राज्ञः is given the sense राजसम्बन्धिनि पुरुषे by secondary means to achieve non-differentiated concordance. But where is the property of having similar case endings here?

The commentary writes विरुद्धार्थकविभक्तिराहित्यं तन्त्रम्, सुप्तिङोश्च न विरोधः । The idea is about case endings without contradicting senses. There is no opposition for सुप् and तिङ् suffixes existing together.

Thus in देवदत्तः पचति non-differentiated concordance is inevitable. Therefore the MKs too should accept the sense of कर्तृ and कर्मन् to the verbal suffix.

The MKs argue- धातोः फलमात्रमर्थः आख्यातस्य भावना अर्थः, भावना शाब्दी आर्थी च, क्रियापदेन अनुक्तः कर्ता आक्षेपात् लभ्यते. 'The verbal root is the expression of only the result. भावना or activity is the meaning of the verbal suffix. भावना is of two kinds as शाब्दी and आर्थी. The unspecified agent by the verb is obtained by presumption. Thus the state of being in apposition is achieved.'

The VKs - K objects by saying that if the above explanation is accepted then the two concepts अरुणाधिकरण (3.1.6.12) and बलाबलाधिकारण cited in the M in the context of ज्योतिष्ठोम become redundant.

Even the derived words like पिंगाक्षी etc cannot be expressive of substances. In the analysis पिंगे अक्षिणी यस्याः सा on the basis of the rule अनेकमन्यपदार्थे (p.2.2.24) the बहुव्रीहि compound shows only relation.

Similarly in विश्वे देवता अस्याः the तद्धित suffix gained by the rule सास्यदेवताः (4.2.28) is also expressive of relation. Thus both are not expressive of substance. But according to MKs, both पिंगाक्षी and एकहायनी are expressions of the substance in the form of the cow. Hence the quality of being red concords with cow as instrument in क्रीणाति.

K objects that if this job was so easy where was the need for the chapter अरुणाधिकरण ?

In बृहद्वैयाकरणभूषण it is stated that in देवदत्तः पचति and पच्यते तण्डुलः as the words are standing in apposition to each other the verbal suffix is the expression of कर्तृ and कर्मन्. This is obvious as, if someone else is cooking there would be no scope for the statement देवदत्तः पचति. Similarly in त्वम् पचसि the decision of the second person is made by पाणिनि --- युष्मद्युपपदे समानाधिकरणे स्थानिन्यपि मध्यमः। (p.1.4.105)

'When the pronoun' thou, understood, and also when the same expressed, is the attendant word 'in agreement with the verb then there is the verbal termination called the middle.'

Moreover, words like पिंगाक्षी etc. in बहुव्रीहि compound express only relation according to पाणिनि. They are not expressive of substances. If the primary meanings of पिंगाक्षी etc. show merely relation and if the sense of substance is presumed by secondary means then the relation with अरुणया is impossible- मुख्यार्थमेव द्रव्येऽन्वयमेति ।

Similar is the case of वैष्णदेवी which is formed by the rule सास्यदेवता (p.4.2.24). This also shows relation and not the substance. In that case the बला बलाधिकरण of M based on the sentence तप्ते पयसि ... (4.1.22.24) has to be dropped.

Thus two chapters become useless. It is not possible to have the state of being in apposition by presuming the agent by secondary means. Therefore the MKs too, have to accept the meanings of the agent and the object for the verbal suffix- इयमेव मीमांसकैः समानाभिधानश्रुतिरिति व्यवह्रियते ।

The कारिका states आश्रये तु तिङः 'the verbal suffixes (are used) in (the sense of) substratum.' According to K. by प्रत्यासत्तिन्याय the principle of proximity,' the 'substratum of action and fruit' is understood. Though Pāṇini has ordained the sense of the agent and the object to लकाराs only, by the rule लः कर्मणि (p.3.4.69), in practice, for the sake of convenience, the verbal suffixes being the substitute of लकाराs, gain these meanings.

According to grammarians the 'meanings of words' is the cause for the unitary knowledge of a sentence. Thus K having demonstrated the meaning of a verb, now deliberates on वाक्यार्थ 'the meaning of a sentence' in the latter half of the कारिका. Here two important doctrines of the philosophy of grammar have been presented. Firstly, with respect to the fruit, action is important. Or action is the qualificand and fruit is the qualifier.' Therefore, though both fruit and action are the meanings of धातु, yet' action conducive to the fruit' is the sense of धातु and not व्यापारजन्यफलम् 'fruit produced by action.'

Secondly, the meaning of the verbal suffix is the qualifier. The agent (कर्तृ) qualifies action, which is the meaning of धातु. In the sentence देवदत्तः पचति, the cognition would be देवदत्ताभिन्न एकाश्रयनिष्ट वर्तमानकालिकः विक्लित्यनुकूलः व्यापारः । Action conducive to softening, related to present tense existing in the substratum qualified by singularity identical with देवदत्तः'.

In the sentence देवदत्तेन तण्डुलः पच्यते, object (कर्मन्) is the qualifier to the fruit. The cognition would be देवदत्तकतृक तण्डुलकर्मक वर्तमानकालिक एकाश्रयिका या विक्लित्तिस्तदनुकूलाभावना. 'Action conducive to that softening, substratum being कर्मन् rice qualified by singularity related to the present tense, the agent being Devadatta (देवदत्त).

Thus action is important in both the forms.

According to the neo-school of grammarians, the fruit is important in passive voice. The verbal cognition would be- देवदत्तनिष्ठवर्तमानकालिकव्यापारजन्य एकत्वाश्रयिका तण्डुलनिष्ठविक्लित्तिः - softening existing in the rice being the substratum qualified by singularity produced by action related to the present tense existing in (देवदत्त) Devadatta.' This view is based on the rule सुपः आत्मनः क्यच् (p.3.1.8). In पुत्रीयति (क्यच्) the cognition is पुत्रविषयक इच्छानुकूलव्यापारः. Here action is important. But why क्यच् is not used in passive by Patañjali. Because in क्यच् the cognition is इष्यते पुत्रः Here fruit is important. Thus Nāgeśa's view is acceptable.

Now K shows the complication in the definition of the Nyaya school. Commentaries refer to the discussion as follows- The doctrine of the N school may be summed up as follows :-

क्रियापदाततिरिक्तस्यप्रथमान्तपदार्थस्य शाब्दबोधे प्राधान्यं, धातोः फलमात्रमर्थः, आख्यातस्यकृतिरित्यर्थः कृतिरात्मनिष्ठोगुणः कर्तरिशक्तौ गौरवमिति कृतौशक्तिकल्पनालाघवम् । or 'In verbal cognition importance is for the first case ending word not specified by the verb. Fruit is the only meaning of the verbal root. कृति or effort is the sense of the verbal suffix. Effort is the quality existing in the self. Power is the agent (कर्तृ) leads to prolixity. Hence it is brief to assume power in effort.' The NKs do not accept the sense of the agent and the object to the verbal suffix. Hence for the concordance of number there is the need for the first case ending word.

K shows the fault of prolixity in the NK view- For the NKs importance for the first case ending word means in the sentence देवदत्तः पचति, the singular number which is the sense of the verbal suffix concords with Devadatta being the first case ending word. In रामौ गच्छतः the dual number concords with रामौ, in तेन गृहं गम्यते, number concords with गृहं the first case ending word. According to K this definition suffers from the fault of दूरान्वय 'remote concordance.'

The VKs. concord the number with the agent and the object which are also the meanings of the verbal suffix. That means two meanings of the same suffix are mutually related. In both schools number which is the meaning of the verbal suffix is the qualifier to the agent and the object. To accept the first case ending word not specified by the verb leads to prolixity.

K gives one more reason to refute the NKs. In the sentence - चन्द्र इव मुखं दृश्यते, the number which is the meaning of the verbal suffix need not concord with only मुख as there is one more first case ending word namely Chandra (चन्द्र) in the sentence. If number concords with Chandra then in the sentence चन्द्र इव मुखे दृश्यते, the verb cannot be in dual number.

Similarly in the other example why should the number concord with Devadatta alone, why not with भुक्त्वाwhich is also a first case ending word? To overcome this fault the NKs include in the definition the expression 'which is not a qualifier to any other word.' In the above sentence Chandra is a qualifier to 'similarity' expressed by the word इव. Again भुक्त्वा is a qualifier to the 'act of going.' Hence the fault is averted. But according to K this leads to prolixity.

According to the rule वर्तमाने लट् (p.3.2.13) time concords with action. This rule is governed by the rule धातोः (p. 3 .1.91). But of the two meanings of the verbal root namely action and fruit, action being the qualified and fruit being only the qualifier time concords with action alone.

Now K assumes the following objection from the NKs-

Well if number can concord with the agent and the object why not with time? Let लट् convey the meanings of the agent and the object in present tense.

K shows two faults here. Firstly if time agrees with the कर्तृ then even after the agent has finished his work, he continues to be in the present and the usage पचति also continues. But in practice as soon as action gets over the past tense अपाक्षीत् is used and not पचति. Similarly the use of पचति continues instead of पक्ष्यति when the action is not yet commenced. Therefore when the action is present लट् is used and not when the agent is in present tense. The grammarians follow usage.

Now K shows how time cannot concord with fruit also. If time agrees with fruit then even though the agent has commenced his action, as long as the result in the form of softening does not occur, पचति cannot be used, instead पक्ष्यति will have to be used. But in practice, the whole is imposed on every part and right at the beginning of action पचति is used. Therefore time concords with action and not fruit.

The doubt raised about the usage 'gets up' in the case of a sick person is removed by saying that effort is the quality of the self. Therefore by seeing the movements of his limbs alone the usage is accepted by all.

According to K it may be said that आख्यातस्यकर्ता कर्म संख्या कालः अर्थविशेषाश्च अर्थाः । Time concords with action. Number with कर्तृ and कर्मन्, अर्थविशेषाः प्रेरणादयः विषयता सम्बन्धेन धात्वर्थक्रियायां अन्वयन्ति। The specific meanings like causal etc concord with action by the relation of being the content.

Here K tries to prove further with many more points that in a verb 'action which is the meaning of the verbal root is important.

K refers to the objection raised by the NKs as follows-

According to the view प्रकृति प्रत्ययार्थयोः.... the meanings of the verbal suffix namely the agent etc. are important in a verb.

The commentaries refer to Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa's views as follows-

In participles like कारकः, पाचकः and तद्धिताः or primary suffixes like औपगवः, दाशरथी etc the meaning of the suffix is important. Here action shows itself like a substance. But verbs are exceptions to this general statement. The statements of Yaska and Patanjali happen to be the authority on this. In the above statement of Yaska,

आख्यातं is used in the sense of तिङन्त or verb and भाव in the sense of action. Therefore action is important in verbs. Similarly while explaining the rule भूवादयो धावतः (1.3.1). Patanjali writes पच्यादयः क्रियाः भवतिक्रियायाः कर्त्र्यो भवन्ति । Actions पच् etc become the agents for the action (in) भू. Here पचति is clearly referred to as क्रिया. If the sense of the verbal suffix was important he wouldn't have called this क्रिया. Thus both यास्क and पतञ्जलि have given importance to action which is the meaning of the verbal root.

Now K demonstrates various faults in the view of the NKs.

According to the NKs the meaning of the word in the first case ending is the most important in a judgement. In the sentence देवदत्तः पचति the verbal cognition would be पाकानुकूल वर्तमानकलिक कृत्याश्रयः देवदत्तः - Devadatta is the substratum of the effort related to present tense conducive to softening.

K shows the difficulty in the sentence पश्यमृगो धावति and refers to NK's view which may be summed up as follows-

According to the NKs the judgement would be- मृगकर्तृक धावनानुकूल व्यापारकर्मक त्वत्कर्तृक दर्शनम् - 'the view in which you are the agent, कर्मन् being action (कर्तृ) conducive to running (in which) the deer is the agent. 'If the sense of the verbal suffix gains importance there would be two sentences like मृगो धावति and पश्य because एकतिङ्वाक्यं is the definition of a sentence. In मृगोधावति the cognition would be वर्तमानकालिक धावनानुकूल कृत्याश्रयः मृगः । - deer (which is) the substratum of the effort conducive to running related to the present tense.' In पश्य the cognition would be तत्कर्मक दर्शनाश्रयः त्वम् - 'you (who is) the substratum of the sight in which the deer is the कर्मन् - Or if the cognition धावनानुकूलव्यापाराश्रय मृगकर्मक दर्शनाश्रयः त्वम् is accepted, even then it cannot be a single sentence. Here, - मृग will be the कर्मन् for the act of seeing. Though मृग is ordained to be the कर्तृ for the act of running it is not अभिहित 'expressed' with respect to the act of seeing. Therefore the second case affix sets on the अनभिहित कर्मन् - non-specified कर्मन्.

But according to the NKs धावनक्रियाजनक कृतिविशिष्ट मृग - 'deer qualified by the effort conducive to the act of running' becomes the object (कर्मन्) in the act of seeing. Then the expression मृगो धावति 'the deer runs' conveys 'qualified sense' and therefore it is not a प्रातिपदिक 'nominal stem,' and will not gain the कर्मन्. As a result the second case ending will not set in after मृग.

In that case, in the sentence नीलं घठं आनय if the नीलगुणविशिष्टघठ concords with the act of bringing or knowing, then the sentence नीलं घठं आनय cannot be used. Again under अनभिहितो in the सूत्रभाष्य in the sentence कटं भीष्मं कुरु, it is said कटोपि कर्म भीष्मादयोपि ।

As explained above if the second case sets in after मृग then by the rule लटः शतृशानचौ अप्रथमा समानाधिकरणे (p.3.2.124). 'The affixes, शतृ and शानच् are substitutes of लट् when concording with a word not in first case.' Thus- शतृ प्रत्यय sets in after the verbal root. Then the sentence would be धावन्तं मृगं पश्य and not पश्य मृगो धावति 'See ! the deer runs,' which is approved by all.

The NKs argue that, to avoid the second case after मृग the कर्मन् तम् may be supplied as मृगो धावति, तं पश्य ।

According to K three faults arise out of this.

Firstly it loses the property of being a single sentence, secondly whatever the speaker wants to convey is not conveyed. Instead of seeing the 'running' of the deer, the deer is being viewed. Thirdly it gives rise to wrong meanings in other sentences like - श्रुणु, देवदत्तः गायति । In this sentence even if the object तम् is supplied, it is not possible for तम् to concord with the act of hearing, as music can be heard to and not Devadatta. The NKs have no answer for this.

What is भावनाप्रकारबोध or cognition in which action is the qualifier? In the sentence पश्यमृगो धावति the cognition would be मृगकर्तृक धावनकर्मक त्वत्कर्तृ दर्शनम्. Here the act of seeing in which 'you' is the कर्तृ, the act of running is the object for which the deer is the कर्तृ. The action of the root धाव् is the qualifier, that of the root दृश् is the qualified.

Therefore in sentences like this having qualified verbs, if the state of being a single sentence is to be achieved, as declared by the भाष्य, then the cognition where action is the qualifier should be accepted as in the case of participles.

In कृदन्तs the knowledge of कर्तृ is the cause of comprehension. Similarly in भावनाप्रकारकबोध 'cognition in which action is the qualifier,' the knowledge of action, which is the sense of an other verbal root is the cause.

The Mahabhasya writes पच्यादयः क्रियाः भवतिक्रियायाः कर्त्र्यो भवन्ति। - 'The actions (in) पच् etc., are agents for the action (in) भवति, In पचति and .भवति the cognition would be पाककर्तृकभावना - 'action for which पाक is the कर्तृ. Here action expressed by the root पच् is the qualifier. The action expressed by the root भू is the qualified.

Bhartrhari also writes-

सुबन्तं हि यथानेकं तिङन्तस्य विशेषणम् ।
तथा तिङतमप्याहुः तिङन्तस्य विशेषणम् ।।

"Just as many nouns qualify a verb even a verb qualifies another verb." Thus the knowledge of action comes in the form of both the qualifier and the qualified. According to K action is important both in active and passive as shown in the text.

Now K tries to prove the presence of action in all verbal roots. The Naiyayikas argue that-

In the sentence घठो नश्यति - 'pot perishes' only the results in the form of destruction is seen. Action is not visible. Hence the statement that verbal root has meanings in the fruit and the action cannot be accepted.

According to K even in नश्यति there is action. Because the material for destroying the pot qualified by the state of being the counter positive, has to be brought. Then the 'beating by a stick' will be व्यापार 'action' in घठो नश्यति. When action is going on the usage will be 'is being destroyed,' when it is over 'destroyed' and when it is yet to happen 'will be destroyed.'

K anticipates another doubt as follows- In sentence like देवदत्तः जानाति इच्छति two fruits are clearly visible but action is not visible, as both knowledge and desire reside in the self by intimate relation.

According to K there is नश्यति and इच्छानुकूल व्यापार even here. This action is not different from the property of being the substratum of knowledge and desire which reside in the self. Some say, action is in the form of contact between the self and the mind. Thus action is present in all verbal roots is proved .

Now K gives the preamble to the next कारिका ।

According to the maxim सकृदुच्चरितः शब्दः सकृदर्थम् गमयति - 'a word uttered once conveys meaning only once' that is, two meanings namely कर्तृ and कर्मन् for the verbal suffix cannot be conveyed simultaneously. Then just as there is the awareness of the sense of the agent alone in पचति etc, there can be also the awareness of the object alone. This doubt is clarified in the next कारिका.

The earlier कारिका states , ‘आश्रये तु तिङः स्मृताः’ 'the verbal suffixes convey कर्तृ and कर्मन् This कारिका explains as to when the verbal suffix implies the sense of कर्तृ and when, कर्मन्. According to K this कारिका points out that out of the two meanings of a root, one is highlighted by a verbal ending through its connection with the substratum denoted by it. The active endings (परस्मैपद) which convey agent highlight the action since it is closely connected with the agent, like देवदत्तः पचति, देवदत्तः अपचत् etc. whereas the passive endings (यक्, आत्मनेपद etc, which convey कर्मन् highlight the fruit which rests in the objects, like अपाचि तण्डुलः etc.)

In पचति etc, the affix शप् from the rule कर्तरि शप् (p.3.1.68) conveys कर्तृ. In पच्यते etc., the affixes यक् and चिण् by the rules भावकर्मणोः (p.1.3.13), सार्वधातुके (p.3.1.67) and चिण्भावकर्मणोः (p.3.1.66) express the कर्मन्. Otherwise, the meanings कर्तृ etc. for verbal suffixes having been already conveyed by the rule लः कर्मणि (p.1.4.69) the rules कर्तरिशप् etc., would become useless. Thus the verbal suffix conveys only one meaning at a time as shown. The grammatical derivation given with the intention of conveying specific meanings is the authority in this matter.

K refers to an objection by the MKs regarding कर्मकर्तृ or object agent form of sentences.

As stated in the कारिका even when तण् , यक्, and चिण् are present, there is no concordance of the substratum in the object. Even in the object of शप् etc., there is concordance of the substratum in the action. Hence fault occurs in sentences like क्रमादमुम् नारद इत्यबोधि सः and पच्यते तण्डुलः स्वयमेव which are in कर्मकर्तृ form. According to K-

The word अबोधि is the third person singular of the root बुधवगमने in लुङ् and implies कर्तृ. Now चिण् is substituted for च्लि by the rule दीपजन (3.1.61) and then elision is ordained for the suffix त by the rule चिणोलुक् (6.4.104). Hence the fault does not arise as यक् etc, are added on the basis of similarity i.e., कर्मवत् - object like.

The intention of showing the state of being the agent in the object is to indicate convenience. In पच्यते etc. यक् is not added in the usual sense but on the basis of similarity. Hence, there is no violation.

The कर्मकर्तृ construction is an exception to the general rule regarding meaning of different suffixes explained in the कारिका No.3. In the कर्मकर्तृ construction the suffix यक् which generally conveys चिण् is employed in the sense of कर्तृ. On the contrary, the suffix . चिण् which generally conveys कर्मन् is used to convey कर्तृ in forms like अबोधि. This कारिका states the rule for such usage.

यथागमम् means as per the rules of the science of grammar. Explains K's views. that due to the similarity ordained by the rule कर्मवत्कर्मणा (p.3.1.87) the suffixes यक् and चिण् have set in. Hence there is nothing wrong.

Having explained the meaning of object- subject type of sentences. K takes up the earlier discussion about भावना. The प्रभाकर school of MKs and also the NKs do not accept भावना in धातु. Hence it requires to be proved. Here commentators differ in their views regarding the meaning of the expression लडाद्यन्त. Some take it as -धातु and some as तिङन्त -a verb.

Then the expression लडाद्यन्त refers to धातु only on the basis of अतद्गुणसंविज्ञानबहुव्रीहि. The commentaries also support the sense of धातु only. But R.K. on the basis of tat.dar. favours the sense of verb and not धातु.

The arguments of these commentators may be summed up as follows- Those who give the sense of धातु argue that लडाद्यन्त means लडादयः अन्ते यस्मात्सः - thus on the basis of अतद्गुण संविज्ञान बहुव्रीहि seen here it implies धातु only. तद्गुण संविज्ञान बहुव्रीहि means तस्य अन्यपदार्थस्य गुणः विशेषणं तद्गुणः, तद्गुणानां संविज्ञानं क्रियान्वयितया विज्ञानं यत्र तत् - तद्गुणसंविज्ञानम् i.e., the qualifiers concord with the sense of another word by contact or by intimate relation. For example द्विवासो देवदत्तः भुङ्क्ते, लम्बकर्णम् आह्वय etc. न तद्गुणसंविज्ञानं - अतद्गुणसंविज्ञानम् - For ex. चित्रगुम् अनयं दृष्टमधुरां अनयम् । Here the concordance of action is with the other substance. As लट् etc. come after the verbal roots by अतद्गुणसंविज्ञान बहुव्रीहि it means तिङन्त. According to Br.bh. also it is verb. Therefore the expression लडाद्यन्त may be taken to mean - तिङन्त only.

This कारिका refutes some NKs and PKs who say that भावना is not the meaning of the verbal root. Sub. writes that in सैव, the pronoun सा refers to व्यापार, hence the feminine usage appears incorrect. It is not so, as the feminine gender concords with भावना. Hence the sense would be- यः व्यपारः स उत्पादना or यः व्यापारः सः उत्पादना, सा एव सैव or सः एव like सैव दाशरथी रामः। There is the elision of सुप् by the rule सोचिलोपः (p,6,1.130) and then वृद्धि by the rule इकोगुणवृद्धि.

पचति - according to the doctrine of grammar, धातु is the expression for both fruit and action. विव्रियमाण is the word 'to be explained. विवरण is its 'explanation'. Here पचति is explained as पाकं उत्पादयति 'produces पाक,' 'action leading to पाक' or 'what produces पाक ' etc.

In these explanations the presence of action is obviously seen. Hence the root पच् is an expression of action.

K refers to an objection as follows-

The inclusion of the word क्रिया in the कारिका gives the desired meaning. Then why is the word व्यापार used again? The reply is, there is difference between the meanings of व्यापार and क्रिया. क्रिया is generally understood to convey an effort whereas व्यापार denotes activity. B mentions the word व्यपार in the कारिका deliberately in order to include actions like blowing the pipe etc in the meaning of the root पच्.

Refers to an objection by the NKs as follows- If all the activities such as blowing the pipe etc are included in the meaning of the root' पच् then पच् will have as many शक्यतावच्छेदकs as the activities constituting its meaning. A word , which is a शक्य- 'possessing power' is connected with one शक्य 'denotative meaning' and therefore has only one' शक्यतावच्छेदक, the state of being the effort.' However, according to the grammarians, different verbal roots will have different limitors of powers. Whereas according to the NKs there will be only one limiter of power for all roots. Hence it is brief to say so.

Darpaṇa refers to the objection by the GNs as follows:

If कृति or 'effort' is accepted as the meaning of the verbal root, fault arises in sentences like रथो गच्छति, चक्षुर्जानाति etc. There is no effort in रथ and चक्षुस् being non-sentious objects.

Subodhini refers to the NKs reply to the above argument- In such sentences where the expressed meaning is affected, 'action' is imagined by secondary means.

According to K this reply is not acceptable. Saralā writes that, in the sentence गंगायां घोषः the NKs give secondary meaning to the word गंगा as the state of being the bank of गंगा. In fact the fault of prolixity exists here. According to usage, the root पच् conveys all the intervening actions through शक्ति or 'power.'

Therefore, even if the state of blowing..... etc. are taken as शक्यतावच्छेदकs or 'limitors of being power' there is no fault.

Now K. refers to the views of all those who do not accept व्यपार as the meaning of धातु.

Well, if only 'fruit' is the sense of धातु and not 'action' also, then the definition of कर्मन् would be- फलाश्रयत्वम् कर्मत्वम् 'The state of being कर्मन् is the state of being the substratum of fruit.' Then in घठं भावयति, the word घठ is the substratum of the fruit in the form of production. Hence being कर्मन् the second case sets in. Similarly even in घठो भवति, the word घठ gains second case. It is not right to say that the object sign is set aside by the agent sign. Because according to the NK view there is no definition of कर्तृ, which is common to both sentious and non-sentious objects, as धातु has the sense of effort, only sentious objects can be कर्तृ.

Hence the definition of कर्तृ 'the agent' cannot be कृत्याश्रयत्वम् or 'the state of being the agent is the state of being the substratum of effort.' Similarly the definition - कारकचक्रप्रयोक्तृत्वम् कर्तृत्वम् or 'the state of being the agent is the state of being the instigator of the cycle of कारकs also has the fault of non-pervation in sentences like असिः छिनत्ति, स्थाली पचति, घठो भवति etc. Thus when the NKs do not have a proper definition of कर्तृ or 'the agent' how can the object sign be set aside by the 'agent sign.' Thus the NKs are refuted.

The MKs define कर्तृ or 'the state of being the agent is the state of being the substratum of action conducive to the sense of धातु. In the sentence घठो भवति, the fruit in the form of existence is the meaning of the root भू. Hence the agent sign sets in after घठ.

The commentary refers to K's refutation of the MK definition as follows -

The definition of the MKs has the fault of over application.

Every कारक like कर्मन् , करण etc. is bound to be the substratum of anyone of the actions conducive to the fruit being the sense of धातु as क्रियाजनकत्वं कारकम् - 'कारक is what generates action,' is the definition of कारक. For example in the sentence देवदत्तः गृहे हस्ताभ्यां विप्राय पात्रात् अन्नं ददाति, all the कारकs are responsible for the act of charity. Here देवदत्त is the कर्तृ, गृहे is अधिकरण or 'location', हस्त is करण or 'instrument,' विप्र is संप्रदान 'recipient,' पात्रात् is अपादन or fixed point and अन्नं is कर्मन् 'object.' But according to the MKs definition of कर्तृ all the कारकs gain the agent sign. Hence second case cannot be avoided in घठः भवति.

But according to GNs this fault does not arise. As all कारकs produce action, if they gain the agent sign, the other signs अपादान etc. become useless. Therefore, though all the कारकs are originators of action from their respective places, still that alone which produces action independently gets the कर्तृसंज्ञा or the 'agent sign.' This is the idea of the rule स्वतंत्रः कर्ता (p.1.4. 54).

Under the rule कारके (1.4.23) even the M.Bh. writes एवंतर्हि प्रधानेन समवाये स्थाली परतन्त्रा, व्यवाये स्वतन्त्रा, किं पुनः प्रधानम् ? कर्ता, कथं ज्ञायते कर्ता प्रधानमिति । यत्सर्वेषु कारकेषु सन्निहितेषु कर्ता प्रवर्तयिता भवति इति। or 'If so, स्थाली is dependent when it is in association with the कर्तृ and is independent when it is not in association with the कर्तृ'. Then which is प्रधान ? How is it known that कर्तृ is प्रधान ? Since he makes all the accessories which are ready at hand to do their work. In the sentence- स्थाली काष्ठैः पचति, स्थाली is regarded as the agent. Bh also confirms the same idea-

निष्पत्तिमात्रे कर्तृत्वं सर्वत्रैवास्ति कारके ।
व्यापार भेदापेक्षायां करणादित्व सम्भवः ॥

Therefore K now proceeds to give one more reason to prove 'action' also as the sense of धातु. If action is not accepted as the meaning of धातु then the idea of transitive and intransitive verbs will be set aside. In the statement स्वार्थफलव्यधिकरण व्यापारवाचकत्वं सकर्मकत्वम् । स्वार्थ means both फल and व्यपार the meanings of the verbal root. If they exist in different locations, then it is a transitive verb. In the sentence देवदत्तः तण्डुलः पचति - 'softening' is the fruit located in तण्डुल. The act of cooking is in Devadatta. Hence the root पच् is transitive. In the sentence देवदत्तः शेते, both the fruit and action viz. sleeping and 'closing the eyes' are in Devadatta. Hence the root शीङ् is intransitive.

K assumes the following reply by the NKs- If a list of all the transitive verbs is prepared and the rest are stated to be intransitive verbs, then this arrangement will not be disturbed.

This reply cannot be accepted, according to K, as there is no certainty about roots being either transitive or intransitive. Because the same verbal root can be either, in different senses, for example the root वह प्रापणे.

1. सेवकः भारं वहति (transitive)
2. नदी वहति (intransitive)

Many verbal roots change to transitive with prepositions. For eg. सः भवति, सः दुःखं अनुभवति. Hence both fruit and action are the meanings of धातु.

Now K explains the meaning of the latter half of the कारिका. If fruit alone is the meaning of धातु, then the root कृ like the root यत् becomes intransitive, against usage. Because the 'fruit' of both is effort. Therefore it is necessary to accept the sense of action also along with fruit. Otherwise all verbal roots will be either transitive or intransitive.

Now, based on the latter half of the कारिका K refutes the views of the NKs. that only ज्ञान and यत्न are the meanings of roots like ज्ञा and कृ.

According to ancient NKs, the verbal root when transitive has meaning in both fruit and action. But roots like ज्ञा and कृञ् convey only the activities ज्ञान and यत्न. There is no sense of fruit in them.

According to K, if 'fruit' is not the expressed meaning of the verbal root, how to explain, फलव्यधिकरणव्यपार or 'action present in a location other than that of the fruit'? In the sentence क्रियते घठः it is not right to say that कृ is, transitive by secondary means and hence gains the passive लकार. Even if this is accepted, the 'fruit' is not seen by secondary means. As, in गंगायां घोषः though the bank is the secondary sense, the act of taking bath etc is not possible from this. The root कृ being naturally intrasitive, passive लकार will not set in.

The commentary writes that the expression 'not effort' means that 'effort' alone is not the sense of the root कृञ्. The sense of 'fruit' is also expressed. Thus the meaning of the root कृ will be

उत्पत्तिरूपफलसहितयत्नम् 'effort' along with the fruit in the form of creation.'

According to K, due to कर्मवद्भाव the roots पच् and भिद् are used as पच्यते ओदनः स्वयमेव and भिद्यते काष्ठं स्वयमेव. If कृ has only the sense of effort, it being the property of a sentious being, the sentence- क्रियते घठः स्वयमेव would be wrongly derived. But this is popular in usage. Therefore if fruit is also the sense of धातु, then कर्मवद्भाव sets in, as fruit of the form of creation is only घठ. Thus the sentence क्रियते घठः स्वयमेव would be gained.

Now K assumes the following objection- If the sense of fruit is also accepted for the root कृञ् to gain कर्मवद्भाव, then as the root ज्ञा is also transitive, कर्मवद्भाव will set in, as विषयतावच्छिन्नावरणभंग - 'destruction of the cover of ignorance limited by the state of being the subject.' Thus the sentences ज्ञायते घठः स्वयमेव and उत्तरदेश संयोग - contact with the subsequent place being the means of the root गम् the sentence गम्यते ग्रामः स्वयमेव would be wrongly derived. But such usage is not used in the world, why? The reply is given in the next कारिका. (७)

This कारिका states the doctrine of the GNs. on कर्मवद्भाव. According to K, the word धातोः extends from the rule धातोरेकाचः (p.3.1.22). Again, the inclusion of the word कर्मणा in the rule कर्मवत् कर्मणा तुल्यक्रियः (p.3.1.87), enables to gain the कर्मवद्भाव in sentences like असिः छिनत्ति, स्थाली पचति, where करण and अधिकरण are used in the sense of कर्तृ. According to the GNs, the कर्मस्थक्रियाs apply only to निर्वर्त्य and विकार्य and not प्राप्यकर्मन्s।

K. gives one more example to show that 'fruit' is also the expressed meaning of धातु.

If only 'action' is the meaning of धातु then actions responsible for पूर्वदेशविभाग - 'separation from the earlier place' and उत्तरदेशसंयोग - 'contact with subsequent place,' being the same in both त्यज् and गम् they become synonymous words.

It is impossible to say with certainity that separation has resulted from त्यज् and contact from गम्. But if both 'fruit and action' are accepted as the sense of धातु, this fault does not occur. Thus transitive roots also express the sense of fruit.

Moreover in the roots भूसत्तायां, एधवृद्धौ etc. the sense of fruit is directly expressed. Therefore, whether verbal roots are transitive or intransitive, they express both the senses namely 'fruit' and action.'

Even Patañjali writes द्व्यर्थः पचि (M.bh.). In the sentence तुण्डलान् ओदनम् पचति, to manage, two कर्मन्s namely the विकार्यकर्मन् - तण्डुल, and the निर्वर्त्य कर्मन् - ओदन, the two meanings उत्पत्ति and विकृति have to be accepted for the root. पच् This is the meaning of the भाष्य. Fruit is not व्यपार, yet as only one action is the cause for two kinds of fruits, namely, उत्पत्ति and विकृति one action only is the meaning of धातु not two actions.

In this situation, according to those who do not accept fruit as the expressed meaning of धातु, the fact that पच् has two meanings becomes irrelevant. To see that the words of the भाष्य-द्व्यर्थः पचि becomes relevant, it is but proper to accept both fruit and action as the expressed meanings of धातु.

Now K analyses the MKs view on the meaning of the verbal root, as a preamble to the next कारिका wherein he refutes the same. The MKs argue as follows-

Let fruit and action be the expressed meaning of the verbal root and the verbal suffix respectively. This is based on the maxim that 'of the meanings of the root and the suffix the meaning of the suffix is important.' If action is the meaning of the suffix, then it co-ordinates with the statement of Yaska namely भावप्रधानमाख्यातम्- 'A verb expresses action prominently.'

This view is further substantiated by Jaimini's सूत्र - शब्दवत्तूपालभ्यते तदागमे हि दृश्यते, तस्य ज्ञानम् यथा अन्येषाम् (JA.1.15). It means तदागमे हि यत् दृश्यते तत्तस्यवाच्यमिति, अगमनं अगमः, प्रयोगेति यावत् तस्मिन्सति दृश्यते ज्ञायते इति तदर्थः - भावना is the meaning of निप् etc. Only after the suffix तिप् is added, the sense of action is revealed. Therefore 'action' is the meaning of the verbal suffix and 'fruit' is the meaning of the verbal root. Accordingly, the definitions of transitive, intransitive and कर्तृ are stated.

Transitive - In the sentence देवदत्तः पचति, the action which is the meaning of the verbal suffix तिप् is in Devadatta. The fruit in the form of softening is in rice. Thus fruit and action are present in different locations.

In the transitive sentence देवदत्तः शेते both the fruit in the form of sleeping and action, like closing the eyes etc., exist in Devadatta. Thus fruit and action are present in the same location.

Now according to the MKs- आख्यातार्थव्यापाराश्रयत्वम् कर्तृत्वम्, or the state of being the agent is the state of being the substratum of action which is the meaning of the verbal suffix.

मीमांसकम्मन्यः - means one who considers himself as a मीमांसक. By using this expression K has shown that the grammarians have no opposition with the MKs but with the commentators who have wrongly interpreted the text and are proud of themselves. Therefore K shows fault in the above argument.

Now K argues further, to show that व्यापार is also the expressed meaning of धातु. The commentator refers to the argument as follows-

According to the MKs, when cooking has started, and not yet completed, then, for the question पाकोजातो न वा ? The reply would be भविष्यति. Hence 'fruit' alone is the meaning of धातु.

तस्मात् means बुद्धिस्थपरामर्शकत्वम् - with this argument in mind, K presents his views as follows -

(i) If the meaning of the root गम् is only "fruit" then in the sentence ग्रामो गमनवान्, the fruit would be संयोग or "contact". If the suffix ल्युट् is added in the impersonal sense to the root गम् then also the meaning of गमन would be 'contact'. Thus contact is always present in both कर्तृ or Devadatta and others, and कर्मन् i.e. ग्राम etc. Then like देवदत्तो गमनवान्, there would be ग्रामो गमनवान्. This fault can be avoided by including व्यपार also as the expressed meaning of धातु.

(ii) If fruit alone is the meaning of the verbal root then, even if action is present the expression पाको भवति cannot be used till the fruit is seen. But in usage, whether fruit is seen or not, the sentence पाको भवति is used. Hence action is also the meaning of the verbal root.'

(iii) If fruit alone is the meaning of धातु then, the statement - पाको विद्यते would be made, when 'fruit' alone is seen at the end of व्यापार

(iv) Objection by the MKs-

If action conducive to the fruit is the meaning of impersonal suffixes like ल्युट्, घञ् etc. then गमन would mean "action favourable to contact and पाकम् would mean 'action favourable to softening.' Now, this 'action conducive to contact,' "not being present in ग्राम the usage ग्रामो गमनवान् is avoided. Similarly, whether fruit exits or not, the statement पाको भवति would be made and the statement पाको विद्यते would not be made, due to the absence of action and presence of only fruit.

According to K the argument cannot stand - Because, in the rule लः कर्मणि (p. 3.4.69), the meaning of the verbal suffix, according to the MKs is "action". In the rule कर्तरि कृत् (p. 3.4.67) the meaning of the suffixes घञ् etc is also action. In that case, the rule भावे (p. 3.3.18) would be redundant. Hence the suffixes घञ्, ल्युट् etc., are not expressive of action.

In पचति, पाकं shows fruit and कृ shows action. Hence पाकं करोति is the explanation of the root पच्. The MK's explanation only supports the view of GNs.

According to the MKs the verbal suffix has three meanings viz, काल, संख्या and व्यपार. In the word करोति, conveys action and ति expresses number and time. In this way even the root कृ has the sense of action. If they accept कृ as expressive of action, where is the difference between the two schools ? This is the secret. Even Patanjali on भूवादयो धावतः says - कथम् ज्ञायते क्रियावचनः पच्यादयः ? यदेषां करोतिना सामानाधिकरण्यं किं करोति ? पचति इति, thus he has clearly stated that even the explanation is of the verbal root only. Again, if otherwise, there would be no agreement with पक्वान् etc.

K further explains the intention of B as follows - the commentary writes - In the statement प्रकृतिप्रत्ययौ सहार्थं ब्रूतः तयोः प्रत्ययार्थस्य प्राधान्यम् root and suffix together convey the sense of relationship. Of them the sense of the suffix is important. The verbal cognition would be प्रकृत्यर्थप्रकारतानिरूपित विशेष्यता - शालिप्रत्ययार्थः or प्रकृत्यर्थप्रकारबोधंप्रति विशेष्यतया तदुत्तरप्रत्ययजन्योपस्थितिः हेतुः - this is the cause effect notion between the two.

The commentary refers to the argument by the MKs as follows-

Kumarila Bhaṭṭa while talking about the method of concordance in the sentence वाजपेयेन यजेत quotes the कारिका, सम्बन्धमात्रम् .... by श्रुति only general relationship is shown between the fruit, the sense of धातु and भावना, the sense of the verbal suffix. श्रुति cannot convey the unrelated कर्मन् and करण, which belong to the same location. Thus the approved sense by श्रुति is यागसम्बन्धी भावना and not यागकर्मकभावना. Similarly in पक्वान्, पाकसम्बन्धी कर्तृ is the meaning. Thus the fault is overcome.

K counters the argument as follows -

Sarala writes - According to the खलेकपोतन्याय all कारकs concord in action only. It is not possible to imagine common relationship between कारकाs.

The commentary writes that even in verbal cognition compatibility is the cause. Compatibility is not merely to convey the meaning but to be useful in mutual concordance. In the sentence घटेन जलमाहर the hearer knows that if the pot is having a hole, then it is not possible to bring water. Hence a pot without a hole would be useful in concordance. Here the compatibility of a कारक is to get related with action.

MKs argue that, along with every कर्तृ, action is presumed. Therefore action will be presumed from कर्तृ, implied by the sense of the suffix क्तवतु. Thus the fault is avoided.

K proceeds with his arguments - If the view प्रकृतिप्रत्ययौ ... is accepted then in अजा, अश्वा, छागी etc., the sense of the feminine suffix would be prominent. Then the sense of the stem word would be secondary. This is contrary to our cognition.

The feminine affixes टाप्, ङीप् etc. show the state of being feminine present in the प्रकृति (stem) the qualificand. Hence अजा means स्त्रीत्वविशिष्टाजव्यक्ति and not अजनिष्ठस्त्रीत्व.

Hence, the view प्रत्ययार्थः etc. is a general rule (उत्सर्गः) it applies only to the suffixes कृत्, तद्धित etc.

Thus cognition comes according to one's own training. Cognition for the NKs, exits in the first case ending word, as the qualificand. But for the MKs and GNs, cognition comes through action being the qualificand. In the secondary meaning the cognition consists of the qualifier delimited by the denotative power according to the poeticians. For instance, in गंगायां घोषः, first the sense of गंगा is understood and then the sense of bank.

Hence the qualities of piety, being cool etc., which exists in गंगा and not in bank are conveyed through the knowledge of गंगा. Otherwise there would be no difference between गंगायां and गंगातटे. Hence cognition depends on one's own proficiency in the शास्त्रs and not on the view - प्रत्ययार्थः etc.

K. supports from पाणिनि. The word अशिष्य extends here. The authority to clear any doubt in this matter is Yaksa's statement भावप्रधानमाख्यातम् - 'action is important in verbs.'

Yaksa writes - चत्वारिपदजातानि नामाख्यातउपसर्गनिपाताश्च. If the word पद should apply, अख्यात would mean तिङन्ता - 'verb'. Even in the गणसूत्र - आख्यातं आख्यातेन क्रियासातत्ये (p. 2.1.72) आख्यात means तिङन्त - 'verb' only.

Now K shows the fault of over application in the definition of the MKs - for the question किं कृतम् ? The reply is पक्वम्. The question is about action and the reply also refers to action. According to the MKs पच् expresses fruit. The suffix क्त expresses कर्मन्. Where is action here ? Hence there is the fault of over application.

At this stage, the MKs say, well, let भावना be the expressed meaning of suffixes कृत् etc., By this the fault of the over application is avoided.

To refute this argument, the word अपि is used in the कारिका. It means that if the MKs accept the suffixes कृत् etc., to be expressions of भावना, it leads to prolixity. As धातु is present both in तिङ् and कृत् forms, it is brief to accept धातु as the expression of भावना. Otherwise, there will be too many limitors of the state of being power. However, if भावना is the expressed meaning of suffixes कृत् etc., then according to '... प्रत्ययार्थः प्रधानम्' in पक्वं etc., भावना gains importance. Then in पक्वः तण्डुलः and पक्त्वा देवदत्तः, the word पक्वः will not stand in apposition with तण्डुलः and पक्त्वा with देवदत्तः . Hence धातु alone is the expression of action.

Now, K gives another proof to show that action is the meaning of the verbal root.

The meaning of the kārikā - किं कार्यम् ..... etc is - According to some, the question and answer style of the earlier kārikā is obviously seen as किं कार्यम् ? पचनीयम् in a tone of continuity. But a study of K's style reveals that whenever he intends to give more proofs to substantiate his view point, he starts with किञ्च. Hence the commentators take किम् together with च coming after the word पचनीयम् as किञ्च कार्यम् पचनीयम् ... etc.

Subodhini writes - as the question and answer style has been adopted already by Bhattoji in the earlier karika like किम् कृतम् ? पक्वम् etc., to avoid the fault of repetition K explains this karika in a different way to prove the same point. Thus the word कार्यम् and पचनीयम् are shown by K as two more examples, stated by Bhattoji. Therefore the second explanation may be taken as the view of K.

The expressions कार्यम् and पचनीयम् are formed by adding the suffix ण्यत् and अनीयर् after the roots कृ and पच् by the rules ऋहलोर्ण्यत् and तव्यत्तव्यनीयरः (3.1.96) respectively. The expression ज्योतिष्ठोमयाजी means ज्योतिष्ठोमेन इष्टवान्. Here according to the Pāṇinian rule,

- करणे यजः (p. 3.2.55), which is governed by the rule भूते (p.3.2.84), when करण or instrument is the contiguous word then the suffix णिनि is added after the root यज्, in the sense of the agent. Thus the कृत् affixes ण्यत्, अनीयर् and णिनि etc. convey the sense of कर्मन्, करण and कर्तृ etc . Now without the sense of व्यापार for the root, these कारकs cannot be formed.

The commentary refers to the reply by the MKs as follows- Considering the action that is implied, even in the absence of a word expressing action, कारकs can be related and formed with the respective suffixes.

Now K states how the MKs defend their view -

Darpaṇa also refers to the argument. In sentences like चैत्रः पक्वान् गौरी पक्ववती, मित्रं पक्ववत्, तौ पक्ववतौ etc., the gender and number are clearly seen. Therefore for the sake of concordance the sense of कर्तृ etc., is accepted for कृत् affixes. This knowledge of कर्तृ leads to the awareness of action by assumption. Just as, in the sentence पीनोदेवदत्तः दिवा न भुंक्ते, assumption of night meal is obvious, the sense of व्यापार too is obvious in verbal roots while forming the कारक.

But, according to K, in that case the same process should be applicable to verbs also. There is no propriety in accepting action in कृदन्त and saying it is expressed by तिङ् in verbs.

K states other reasons to prove his point. What is a सपर्थपद ? समास in Sanskrit is based on पदविधि or rules governing words. This rule applies only to समर्थपदs or semantically connected words, which agree with each other and convey the united sense. For example; राज्ञः, पुरुषः - राजपुरुषः. The word समर्थ "semantically connected" is included to state that the words राज्ञः and पुरुषः in the sentence भार्या राज्ञः and पुरुषो देवदत्तस्य do not form a compound word.

The expressions अन्नेनव्यञ्जनम् and भक्ष्येणमिश्रीकरणम् enjoin असमर्थसमासs or (those) disqualified to form compound words. If it is stated, that they still form compound words, there is need to prohibit it, when they govern different verbs.

The MKs argue as follows -

On the basis of the rules अन्नेनव्यंजनम् (p. 2.1.34) and भक्ष्येण मिश्रीकरणम् (p. 2.1.35) the words सेचन and मिश्रण could be understood to create semantic connection like दध्नासिक्तः ओदनः - दध्योदनः; गुडेन मिश्रितः धानाः गुडधानाः. Similarly in भिन्नः and त्रातः also, समास may be affected, as नखैः भिन्नः.

But according to K it is wrong. Because the rules अन्नेनव्यंजनम् and भक्ष्येण मिश्रीकरणम् have no examples other than दध्योदन and गुडधान. Hence by drawing the actions सेचन and मिश्रण, the capacity to form compound is established. While the rule - कर्तृकरणे कृताबहुलम् (p. 1.1.32) has other examples like हरिणा कृतं - हरिकृतं, शरेण कृतं - शरकृतं etc. and there is no proof for the usage हरित्रातः etc.

If the sense of व्यापार is not accepted, in (the root) कृ even the क्रिया or action that is understood cannot create सामर्थ्य. Even the rule that is included will have no justification. To substantiate this view K writes हरीकृतमिति.

Objection by the MKs -

According to the MKs the state of being semantically connected is established to effect a compound, if there is agreement with even one action. If the words of a compound concord with the same action either directly or indirectly, then also the state of being semantically connected is established, as in धवखदिरौ छिन्दि Similarly in नखैर्भिन्नः by drawing the word अस्मि etc, भिन्नः would be कर्तृ and नखैः would be करण. Thus they get related and achieve the qualification to be समास.

But according to K this cannot be accepted. Because the sentence असूर्यम् पश्याः राजदाराः is declared as an असमर्थसमास by the - भाष्य. Here सूर्यं न पश्यतीति असूर्यम् पश्याः - सूर्यकर्मकदर्शनाभाववन्ताः राजदाराः is the knowledge. Here नञ् conveys प्रसज्यप्रतिषेध, hence gets related with क्रिया and not सूर्य. There is no agreement between नञ् and सूर्य. Hence Patanjali has declared it असमर्थसमास. But according to the MKs this would be a समर्थसमास. Hence their definition is wrong.

K further shows the fault with another example. In the sentence कृतः सर्वः मृत्तिकया, the word सर्व being कर्मन्, मृत्तिकया being करण, they are capable of getting related with the root कृ. This results in the unwanted expression सर्वमृत्तिकः, on the basis of the rule सहसुपा (p. 2.1.4). If this is not accepted, then even in असूर्यम् पश्याः, there would be no rule to effect समास.

K gives one more example to show that the meaning of the suffix तिङ् is not व्यापार 'action' but कर्तृ 'agent'.

In the sentence भावयति घटम्, according to the MKs, the meaning of the verbal root भू is only 'fruit'. The meaning of the suffix णिच् is the action of the employer. The suffix तिङ् shows action which is the meaning of णिच्. Thus घट becomes कर्मन् being the substratum of the fruit.

Similarly instead of भवति घटः, it would be भवति घटम्. This fault does not occur according to the view of the GNs. In भवति घटः, as तिङ् shows कर्तृ viz. घट, it gains the first case ending only.

K now assumes, as to how the MKs would defend against this fault.

According to the MKs, आख्यातार्थ means कर्तृ "agent", who is the substratum of action, which is the meaning of the verbal suffix तिङ्. Thus the substratum of action conveyed by तिङ् is घट. Therefore the sentence would be भवति घटः.

K refutes the MKs view with other examples as follows - In the sentence पाचयति देवदत्तः विष्णुमित्रेण, the word विष्णुमित्र not being the substratum of action implied by the suffix तिङ्, will not gain the 'agent' sign. Then how does it gain the third case ending ?

But according to the GNs धातु itself conveys action. Therefore कर्तृ 'agent' being the substratum of this action and being अनभिहित (p. 2.3.1.) by the suffix तिङ्, the third case is added to विष्णुमित्र. As the suffix तिङ् shows the employer Devadatta the first case sets in.

According to the MKs, in the sentence - ग्रामं गमयति देवदत्तः विष्णुमित्रम्, if विष्णुमित्र is not taken as प्रयोज्यकर्तृ or the "agent employed" the word ग्राम will have no chance to gain the second case. Because, by the rule कर्तुरीप्सिततमं कर्म (P. 1.4.4.) ग्राम becomes the most desired by the कर्तृ "the agent". If it does not gain the कर्मसंज्ञा even the fourth case ordained optionally, by the rule

गत्यर्थकर्मणि (p.2.3.12) will not operate in ग्रामाय गमयति देवदत्तः विष्णुमित्रम्.

Now K anticipates the following reply from the MKs to ward off this fault -

In words ending with the suffix णिच् like गमयति etc. the actions of both the employer and the employed are conveyed by the verbal suffix तिङ्. Thus विष्णुमित्र gains the agent sign.

K replies as follows -

This leads to utter confusion in the sentence पाचयति देवदत्तः विष्णुमित्रेण । How to differentiate between the two agents here ? Both may get either the first case or the third case. Moreover, there is also objections by the rule हेतुमिति (p.3.1.26)

Thus two actions for तिङ् in places of णिच् cannot be accepted.

Again K finds fault in the MK's definition. In sentences like देवदत्तः पक्ता, due to the absence of the verbal suffix, after पच् Devadatta cannot gain the agent sign.

The commentary refers to a refined definition of कर्तृ by the MKs, as णिजाख्यातार्थन्यतरार्थव्यापाराश्रयत्वं कर्तृत्वम् or "the state of being the agent is the state of being the substratum of action conveyed by the verbal suffix, which is not णिच्".

Even then, the fact that the definition suffers from the fault of non-pervasion is not erased. Because, in the sentence देवदत्तः पक्ता, there is no verbal suffix. But the suffix तृच् has come, in the sense of कर्तृ "agent" by the rules कर्तरिकृत् (p.3.4.67) and ण्वुल्तृचौ (p.3.1.133)

The MK may refute saying that, by drawing the words अस्ति, भवति etc., the agent sign is gained for Devadatta.

According to K this is also wrong. Because the suffix तिङ् is after the root अस्. Devadatta cannot become the कर्तृ "agent" for the action conducive to softening, conveyed by पच्. In that case, the suffix तृच् will not set in after पच्. Thus the MK view stands refuted.

Now K explains the latter half of the कारिका. The commentary refers to the MKs objection assumed by K as follows :

The MKs object saying that there is no rule of Pāṇini which says that व्यापार or action is the meaning of धातुनिर्मूलस्व कल्पनाविषयत्वम्. Therefore, it is all the imagination of the grammarians which cannot be accepted as authentic.

K counters the MKs objection as follows - The rule भूवादयो धावतः defines a verbal root. The word आदि stands for व्यवस्था - settlement and प्रकार - similarity. Settlement is known from the established lists of सर्वादि, प्रादि, स्वरादि etc. The expression भवादिगण पठितत्वम् means whatever is stated in the ten गणs gains the धातु symbol. To exclude the indeclinable ह्रिरुक् विना etc. which express action, भ्वादिगणपठित्वम् is stated.

This कारिका explains why the qualifier क्रियावाचकत्वेसति should be included in the definition of धातु.

If the expression क्रियावाचकत्वेसति is not included for the sake of convenience then in, याः पश्यसि, there is chance for the pronoun या to gain धातुसंज्ञा, because या is listed in the अदादिगण. Then in या and शस् there is elision of आ by the rule आतोधातोः (p.6.4.140). This leads to the undesired sentence यः पश्यसि ।

But the MKs argue that, on the basis of the metarule लक्षणप्रतिपदोक्तयोः प्रतिपदोक्तस्यैव ग्रहणम् etc, the pronoun या of यत् is not grasped as it is derived by a rule, (where टाप् etc., are enjoined). Hence it is लाक्षणिक, gained by secondary means.

प्रतिपदोक्त means the expressed meaning of a word. For example, the verbal root या, having the sense of प्रापणे "reaching", is listed in the धातुपाठ, in the same order or आनुपूर्वि. By अव्यय, other indeclinable like सु, मा etc are included. Thus, क्रियावाचकत्वे is not required.

Hence, the purpose is now stated with an other example. The fault of over-application occurs in indeclinables, like वा etc., which present in forms like वाति, सुवति, माति, मिमीते etc., where verbal roots are also present. Hence it is not possible to decide on this basis.

According to K, while explaining this कारिका (११) the word ग्रह or knowledge should be supplied. Because, then only the fault of mutual dependence can be demonstrated, as, such a fault is approved of, only in two instances namely the process of creation and knowledge.

Mutual dependence exists in this world, in the creation of the seed and the sproutling or in "Chaitra's son is Chaitra" and in the knowledge as in हलन्त्यम् (p.1.3.3). But the fault is well-known in पृथ्वीवीजलयोः । In the present case the fault exists in the knowledge. In order to make it clear, the word has to be supplied.

The expression अन्यतम means भ्वादिभिन्न भिन्नत्वम् - "the state of being other than what is other than भवादि is not the state of being a verbal root. Because the rule भूवादयः will have no purpose.

To avoid this confusion K, defines क्रिया as व्यापारसन्तानः, on the basis of the भाष्य. Therefore a धातु is what is cited in the भवादिगण and also an expression of क्रिया.

The MKs object as follows -

According to the grammarians fruit is considered as क्रिया because क्रिया is represented by earlier and later parts of activity. But according to the MKs क्रिया is not the meaning of धातु. What is the mode of usage here ?

The MKs argue that fruit is the meaning of धातु, and "fruit part" is referred to as क्रिया in the भाष्य. Thus the definition of a verbal root could be that which conveys one of the many parts of the fruit like सत्ता "being" and is cited in the गणs."

K counters the argument saying that the indeclinable वा would gain the root-sign, because in usage, the fruit part of विकल्पयति is विकल्प. This वा is cited in the गण also. Hence this definition of the MKs suffers from the fault of over application.

Now, K shows the presence of action even in verbs like अस्ति etc (Karika 12). Subodhini writes that in the present context, the "fruit" of the form of "being" is the qualifier. The qualified is the कर्तृ as the substratum of fruit is the कर्तृ is an intransitive sentence. The qualified is limited by the qualifier. Hence धर्म्यंश in usage is "the fruit". The expression भाव्यत्वेन means by the state of being accomplished भावनानिष्पाद्यत्वेन. K explains the first half of the कारिका with an example. सत्ता or existence is the basis of all action. Yet

अस्ति cannot be answer to the question किं करोति? The truth is that once the existence of something has already been ascertained, the reply अस्ति is impossible, it is not because अस्ति does not express action or process.

For instance in regard to someone, if the question is whether he went away from there or not, the reply is "He still stays there with great effort or difficulty. "Here reference is to the action of 'stating'. Staying or standing is not a व्यापार, since it is apparently not a व्यापार सन्तान . And yet the reply is महतायत्नेन..... This shows that the question is about action and the answer is also about action. It cannot be आम्रान् पृष्ठः कोविदारान् आचष्टे. The use of the word यत्र in the reply shows action. Even in अस्ति "action" is understood by the learned. Thus the roots कृ, भू, and अस् express action in general and the roots like पच् etc. denote particular actions. They may be used in apposition with करोति etc.

Action is more obviously seen, when birth and other meanings are given to अस् etc. In the sentence रोहितो (rohito).... etc, the two words आसीत् and अभवत् show part actions. The settlement of time occurs only with respect to action.

K, supports his view by a कारिका in the V.P. "Time is the means of measuring all material things, while number measures both materials and immaterial things, like two actions, many souls, two twenties, etc Thus time qualifies action, number qualifies everything." The writes - नान्तरेण क्रियां भूतभविष्यद्वर्तमान काला व्यज्यन्ते, अस्त्यादिभिश्चापि भूतभविष्यद्वर्तमानकालाः व्यज्यन्ते - "The time present, past and future do not flash to the mind without action, even by अस्ति etc., the present, past and future times are suggested."

Now K refers to the objection by the MKs as follows. Well if action exists as in अस् etc., why is it not seen as in पचति etc. ? K clarifies this doubt in the latter half of the कारिका. According to K as both fruit and action exist in the same substratum, it is not possible to view them separately.

K refers to the objection by the MKs further as - If धातु is expressive of action leading to fruit then there is chance for all verbal roots to be transitive. Thus the rules लः कर्मणि; गत्यर्थकर्मक;अकर्मकाश्च become redundant. The doubt is removed by the next कारिका - This कारिका defines transitive and intransitive roots. पचति etc., are transitive, as action exists in Devadatta and fruit exits in ओदन. Roots like भू, अस् , are intransitive, as both action and fruit are in the mountain. In roots गम् etc. though fruit and action exist in (Devadatta) देवदत्त, as fruit exists in ग्राम also, they are not intransitive.

K thus explains एकनिष्ठता as एकमात्रनिष्ठता.

writes -

धातोरर्थान्तरेवृत्तेः धात्वर्थे नोपसंग्रहात् ।
प्रसिद्धेः अविवक्षातः कर्मणोऽकर्मक क्रिया ॥

"A transitive root behaves as intransitive, if the verbal root conveys a different sense, if कर्मन् exists in the sense of धातु itself, if कर्मन् is well known (hence not mentioned) and if कर्मन् is not in the view of the speaker."

K assumes the following doubt -

In आत्मानं जानाति both fruit and action exist in the कर्तृ. In ज्ञा-

अवबोधने, the root ज्ञा "to know" (namely) the fruit and the action conducive to it exists in the कर्तृ. In that case, ज्ञा would be an intransitive root. Then how is the presence of the second case in आत्मानम् justified ?

According to K, due to different conditions आत्मन् is of two kinds, the physical and the innerself. Even the भाष्य supports this view, under the rule कर्मवत् (p.3.1.87) द्वौ आत्मानौ शरीरात्मा अन्तरात्मा च, अन्तरात्मा तत्कर्मकरोति येन शरीरात्मा सुखदुःखे अनुभवति, शरीरात्मा तत्कर्म करोति येन अन्तरात्मा सुखदुःखे अनुभवति ।

In ज्ञा, the fruit of the form of knowledge exists in शरीरात्मा, through the relation of being the subject. Action exists in अन्तरात्मा. Hence it is transitive. According to -

एकस्य बुद्ध्यवस्थाभिर्भेदे च परिकल्पिते ।
कर्मत्वं करणत्वं च कर्तृत्वं च उपजायते ॥

"Due to the differentiation (present) in the mind, the state of being कर्मन्, करण and कर्तृ are created for the same object" - like आत्मा, आत्मना, आत्मानं जानाति.

According to the rules सत्वप्रधानं नामानि - "Nouns express substance prominently" and भाववचनमाख्यातं - "Verbs express action", the meanings are basically divided into two namely सत्व or "substance" the basic meaning of a noun and भाव - "action" the basic meaning of a verb. भाव or क्रिया is further of two types as सिद्ध - "accomplished" and साध्य "in the process of accomplishment." The finite verb forms express an action which is a non-substance since it has no number or gender. However, the primary derivatives

(कृतः) convey an action in the form of a substance.

But according to K if an action which is a non-substance is the meaning of a root, it is understood by the root पच् in the derivative पाकः How can then one argue with Patanjali who says action conveyed by a कृत् is a substance ?

K records difference between perhaps B and Helaraja as regards the interpretation of the word आख्यातशब्दे Helaraja means by आख्यातशब्दे a "finite" verb form". Where as B seems to understand as "a sentence containing two आख्यातs." K justifies B.

Commenting on the expression आख्यातशब्दे writes that it is conducive to brevity to take it as षष्ठी तत्पुरुष - आख्यातयोः शब्दे (वाक्ये) instead of बहुव्रीहि by some. Thus according to K it means in sentences like पश्य मृगे धावति and पचति भवति etc.

As for the word भागाभ्यां the meaning प्रकृति and प्रत्यय given by Helaraja is out of context. Because it is possible to gain such a sense by using पचति itself and the use of the word शब्दे goes without any purpose. Hence the intention of B is to show them in a sentence as साध्य and साधना.

Even the commentary supports this view from V.P. - मृगो धावति पश्यति साध्य साधन वर्तिता and gives the meaning as "in a group of verbs". Thus in पश्य मृगो धावति the main action पश्य is in a state of accomplishment, while धावति is the कर्मन् for that action and is in a state of साधन. The cognition being - मृगकर्तृक धावनकर्मक दर्शनक्रिया - "The act of seeing (for which) running is the कर्मन् (for which) मृग is the agent.

In the case of the sentence पचति भवति, it is clearly stated in the भाष्य - also as पच्यादयः क्रियाः भवति क्रियायाः कर्त्र्यो भवन्ति - "The actions (in) पच् etc., become agents for actions (in) भवति'.

According to K even in पाकः etc., action is of two kinds. One is "action in the process of accomplishment" conveyed by the root, the other is "the completed action" revealed by the suffix घञ्.

Now K assumes the following objection and replies - The example is a sentence with two verbs having no relation with gender. But the sentence compared to, is having one कृदन्त viz. पाकः where the suffix घञ् has gender and number. Hence the comparison is not proper.

But according to K it is a fact that in analogy the two objects of comparison will not be identical. For example in चन्द्र इव मुखं, if there was identity between चन्द्र and मुख the very purpose of comparison would be lost. No body would say घटः घट इव.

In the sentence cited above, the point of similarity is between the action धावति being in a state of साधना concording with पश्य as साध्य and पाकः where the sense of the suffix घञ् being in a state of साधन concording with another action like भवति, जायते etc., as a कारक. For example पाकः भवति जायते, etc., but the same root पच् with the suffix तिङ् would be a साध्य क्रिया. This is just like the same person being either a father or a brother depending on his relation with the other. The fact that the साधनक्रिया concords as a कारक is the only point of similarity. Thus the objection is removed.

But the MKs object saying - where is the proof to show that पाकः भवति etc. express action ? According to K the proof lies in the presence of genitive case in ओदनस्य पाकः i.e. ओदनकर्मक पाकक्रिया. If ओदन is not taken as कर्मन् then there is no scope for कर्मणिषष्ठी by the rule कर्तृकर्मणोः कृति (2.3.65). The sixth case is a sure sign of action being in the process of accomplishment.

Dar, refers to another objection. If verbs like भवति etc. are understood there is scope for genitive case. According to K the sixth case sets in only where there is relation with कृदन्त. If घञ् has the state of action completed, then as कारक s concord with only actions in the process of accomplishment, ओदन loses its state of कारक. Thus not being कर्मन् the sixth case will not set in for the expression of connection with the substitute of ल by the sixth case.

Similarly, in काष्ठैः पाकः, काष्ठः is करण कारक. कारकs concord with साध्यक्रियाs only.

Even the sense of "fruit" in roots, are in a state of non-substance (साध्य). Otherwise the verbal adjectives like स्तोकं etc. do not concord with them, but gain कर्मसंज्ञा and neuter gender on the basis of the वार्तिक, - क्रियाविशेषणानाम् कर्मत्वं नपुंसकलिङ्गता च वक्तव्या. Thus मृदुपचति, स्तोकं पचति, सुन्दरं पचति etc.

Similarly, even in कृदन्तs the usage would be मृदुपाकः, स्तोकं पाकः, सुन्दरं पाकः etc. The commentary adds - If these become qualifiers to the action, then the first case singulars is added to them like स्तोकः पाकः etc.

In the last kārikā K proved that in participles like पाकः etc the verbal root conveys the action accomplished. He further proves the same in this karika also by refuting the view of the नव्यNKs.

According to K, the state of being action to be accomplished is defined as one which has no semantic expectancy for another action while action accomplished always has semantic expectancy as किं पाकः भवति, जायते, नष्टः etc.

The objection by the नव्य NKs may be put briefly as follows-

According to the view of Neo-logicians, power is the root and the suffix collectively in कृत्, तद्धित and समासाs etc. The limiter of power should be accepted in पाकः. Power in घञ् etc. is only for the convenience of usage etc.

But according to the GNs the limiter of power is in घञ् as it is conducive to brevity. Moreover, the rules of Panini कर्तरिकृत्, भावे and also the statement कृदभिहितो भावो द्रव्यवत्प्रकाशते from the भाष्य shows that power is accepted in घञ् etc. only at the derivational level.

Further, in the sentence स्तोकः पाकः the word स्तोकः in masculine singular concords as a qualifier with "the accomplished action" conveyed by the suffix घञ् in पाकः. Otherwise, if it were to concord with the action of the root पच् the word स्तोकः would not have had any relation with gender and number. Then by the rules सामान्ये नपुंसकं and एकवचनं उत्सर्गः करिष्यते, the expression would be स्तोकं पाकः.

Hence, according to K, the sentences स्तोकः पाकः, स्तोकौ पाकौ etc exist in usage. Here if power is not accepted in the suffix घञ् etc then स्तोकः पाकः would be wrongly derived.

K gives more proofs to show that action is conveyed by the verbal root in पाकः etc.

The MKs object as follows - Well instead of स्तोकं पाकः why not स्तोकस्य पाकः on the basis of the rule कर्तृकर्मणोः कृति (p. 2.3.65)

In the rule कर्तृकर्मणोः कृति due to the invariable concomittance of the कर्तृ, whatever concords by differentiation is कर्मन् like जगतः कर्ता कृष्णः. But in स्तोकं पाकः the कर्मन् which is a verbal adjective has non-differentiated concordance with the verb. Hence there is no scope for the sixth case.

Secondly in the भाष्य under the rule पूजनात् पूतितमनुदात्तं (p. 8.1.67) to establish the expression दारुणाध्यापाकः, it is split as दारुणं यथाभवति तथाध्यापकः, thus दारुणं is treated as a verbal adjective, thus there is elision of म् resulting in दारुणाध्यापकः Otherwise, if the sixth case was allowed for verbal adjectives that would give rise to the expression दारुणाध्यापकः automatically. Thus it is obvious that the sixth case is not allowed for verbal adjectives.

The argument in the earlier कारिका was based on the view that the कारकs always concord with action. Therefore K now tries to prove the authenticity of this view in the next two कारिकाs.

सम्बोधनान्तं - According to K, the meaning of a word ending in vocative case concords with क्रिया, 'action'. Sarala writes - In the sentence त्वं ब्रूहि देवदत्त due to the approval of the निघात accent on the vocative देवदत्त, and also the rule समानवाक्ये निघात युष्मदस्मादादेशः being ordained only in the case of a vocative existing in the same sentence, vocatives concord with क्रिया 'action'.

In व्रजानि देवदत्त जानीहि as Devadatta concords with the ज्ञानक्रिया 'act of knowing,' and the act of व्रजन 'going' concords as कर्मन्,

there is the state of being in a single sentence for them. Here, the vocative concords with action. Hence gains निघात accent.

On the basis of the भाष्य-आख्यातं सविशेषणं वाक्यं, the state of being in a single sentence is gained for a verb which concords with another verb either by direct or indirect relation. As the sense of vocative does not concord in क्रिया, on the basis of निघात ordained by आमन्त्रितस्य च, (p.8.1.19) it is accepted to be a single sentence.

To gain the state of a single sentence for शालीनं etc. in शालीनं ते ओदनं दास्यामि, indirect concordance with क्रिया is also accepted. By the rule तिङऽतिङः (p.8.1.19) पचति भवति देवदत्त 'cooking is going on Devadatta!' is taken as a single sentence.

By the use of the plural तिङन्तानाम् in the V.P. the word जानीहि is indicated as to be understood. Otherwise there being no scope for निघात, it would be considered as पर्युदासबोधकतिङ्. Then there is the difficulty of the rule going purposeless. But according to the वार्तिक - एक तिङ् वाक्यम्, a sentence with two verbs cannot be a single sentence. But in reality the वार्तिक means, in such sentences one will be the qualified, the other will be the qualifier. Hence there is the approval of the वार्तिक for such sentences.

While commenting on the V.P. Helaraja defines a sentence similarly.

There is a detailed discussion on this even in V.Bh. Therefore, the sentence पचति भवति देवदत्त, being a single sentence, the निघात accent for Devadatta by आमन्त्रितस्य च (p.8.1.19) has the approval of मुनित्रय

According to K. कृत्वोर्थाः means अत्र कृत्वः पदं कृत्वोर्थ सदृशं परम्, कृत्वोर्थ सदृशः अर्थः येशां ते कृत्वोर्थाः, कृत्वसुजादिः इत्यर्थः Thus कृत्वसुच् refers to the suffix कृत्वसुच् and other suffixes expressive of similar sense. According to the rule संख्यायाः क्रियाभ्यावृत्तिगणन कृत्वसुच्, (p.5.4.17) in the sentence पञ्चकृत्वः भुंक्ते, the suffix कृत्वसुच् concords with action. In sentences like द्विः भुंक्ते त्रिः भुंक्ते, चतुः भुंक्ते there is scope for the suffix सुच् when there is relation with action, by the rule द्वित्रिचतुर्भ्यः सुच् (p.5.4.18)

Bh. also writes that suffixes expressive of the repetition of action like कृत्वसुच् cannot be used with words ending in घञ्. One cannot say पञ्चकृत्वः पाकः as such words are not said to be expressive of action.

But the usage द्विः पचति is not allowed. Thus क्रियान्वयिनानामेव संज्ञा-कृत्वसुच् applies only where there is relation with action.

According to K action alone creates the signs कर्तृ, कर्मन् etc. This sense is called योगरूढ - "derivatively conventional". The word कारक is derived from the root कृ with ण्वुल् in the sense of agent (कर्तृ). Thus etymologically it means "a doer" or that which does." Patanjali's interpretation namely, (करोति, कर्तृ कर्म etc.), "that which does" (can set) designations. कर्तृ etc implies that कारक stands for action. The अधिकार कारके thus means क्रियायां. Since all the कारकs like अपादान etc., are taught by the rules governed by the अधिकार-कारके they are connected with action.

प्रथमोवतिः - The commentaries write that the two rules namely तेनतुल्यक्रियाचेद्वतिः (p.5.1.115) and तत्र तस्येव (p.5.5.116) enjoin suffix

वत् in the sense of इव 'like' मधुरावत् स्रुघ्ने प्राकाराः Here the meaning of the sentence namely सादृश्य concords with प्राकार and not with action. Therefore the first rule तेनतुल्यं ... is applicable here. With this idea the expression प्रथमोवतिः is used in the कारिका.

In the sentence ब्राह्मणवत् अधीते क्षत्रियः, the word ब्राह्मण is in the sense of ब्राह्मणकतृकाध्ययनम् thus the resulting sense would be ब्राह्मणकतृकाध्ययनतुल्यं क्षत्रियकर्तृकमध्ययनम् . The suffix वत् concords with क्रिया only. If there is no similarity with action the suffix वत् will not set in. Even in usage like सिंहवत् माणवकः, the concord of वत् is by supplying the action अस्ति. Otherwise the purpose of the expression क्रियाचेत् becomes useless.

धातुसम्बन्धाधिकारे - The suffix ordained by the rule धातुसम्बन्धे प्रत्ययाः (p.3.4.1) concords with action only. Darpana writes धातुशब्दस्य धात्वर्थपरता. That is धातुसम्बन्धे means धातोः धात्वर्थयोः सम्बन्धे - "In the relation of the two meanings of the two verbal roots." This is a governing rule. Thus based on the prominent action, the suffix sets in after the unimportant action in different tenses. In the sentence वसन् ददर्श, the suffix शतृ expressive of present tense has set in the sense of past following a prominent action ददर्श.

Here the relation between वसन् and ददर्श is the state of having a single कर्तृ. The cognition would be अतीतवासकर्तृकर्तृकं दर्शनम् - "The act of seeing the agent, who has also the agent for the act of living related to the past.

The commentary gives another example याहि याहि इति याति, here the action याति is in the sense of लोट् and its concordance is by general and specific notion.

According to K - असमस्तनञ् - does not mean a नञ् not qualified to form a compound, because even पर्युदासनञ् gains समास optionally. etc. Hence this rule applies to expressions where न ब्राह्मणः अब्राह्मणः is not formed.

But the objection is, in प्रसज्यप्रतिषेध the नञ् prohibits the action itself. Therefore there is no proof to say that it concords with action.

According to K in न त्वं पचति and न युवां पचथ etc the prohibition of action is seen. This itself is a proof for the state of being in agreement with action.

In case they express the negation of द्रव्य substance or person, then in न त्वं पचसि if the negaton of त्वं is accepted then there is no scope for the second person in पचसि.

Similarly when 'pot' is present, it is not possible to say घटो न जायते or घटाभावो जायते. Therefore the negation of only action is accepted here and not of substance.

In भूतले घटो न the verb अस्ति is supplied for the purpose of concordance. Even Subodhini writes अस्तिर्भवति परः अप्रयुज्यमानोप्यस्तीति. Thus in the cognition of नञ् the action expressed by धातु is the cause.

But in नब्राह्मणमानाय concording the imposed sense of नञ् in ब्राह्मण etc., leads to discrepancy. The concordance of the sense of absolute negation with action is only accepted.

According to K, the seventh case ordained by the rule यस्य च भावेन भाव लक्षणं (p.2.3.37), concords with action. The two words

भावेन and भाव used in the rule convey action. The sentence गोषु दुह्मानासु गतः is in reply to the question सः कदा गतः ? The action दुह्ममानासु indicates गतः. The substratum, गो of this act and its qualifier दुह्यमाना get the seventh case, this is called सतिसप्तमी.

According to K, the sixth and seventh cases ordained by the rule षष्ठी चानादरे (p.2.3.38) too concord with action. There is the extension of the rule यस्य च The sentence रुदति, रुदतो वा प्राव्राजीत् is in reply to the question कथं सः प्राव्राजीत् ? "How did he renounce ?" K's view on the meaning of the word साधुत्व or the state of being grammatically correct is explained.

पुण्यजनन योग्यत्वं साधुत्वं - the state of being qualified to create merit is साधुत्व. The भाष्य too writes एवमिहापि समानायां अर्थावगतौ शब्देन च अपशब्देन च धर्मनियमः क्रियते शब्देनैव अर्थः अभिधेयः न अपशब्देन इति, एवं क्रियमाणं अभ्युदयकारी भवति इति.

साधुत्व is not the state of being the power, as cognition comes through wrong words also. Thus, according to K, साधुत्व is gained by those words which concords with action only.

The objection is, in the भाष्य , that the word क्रिया has the sense of fruit also.

But the word क्रिया has the conventional sense of व्यापार 'action'. But according to the derivation क्रियते व्यापारेण निष्पद्यते इति क्रिया, the sense of fruit is also conveyed. According to the dictum, योगात् रूढिर्बलीयसी, conventional usage being more powerful than derivative usage, क्रिया means action only.

The commentator substantiates the view of K, that in the ninth chapter of M the conventional meaning of the word उत्तरा viz. the text known by that name is preferred to the derived meaning viz. the later hymns in the veda. Therefore क्रिया means action or धातु.

An objection anticipated by K - In the rule भूवादयोधातवः (p.1.3.1) the word क्रिया stands for भावना 'action,' and in the rule कर्मवत्कर्मणा (p.3.1.87) it stands for fruit in the conventional sense only. Hence neither of the two meanings can be established for क्रिया.

K argues as follows -

It is already shown that, in a sentence, all the कारकs as qualifiers concord with action, the sense of धातु. Even the fruit is a qualifier to action. According to जैमिनि ‘गुणानां च परार्थत्वात् असम्बन्धः समत्वात् स्यात्’ (p 3.1.20) or 'As the qualifiers (help to convey) the sense of the qualified, being equals (stand) unrelated (to each other). K also supports his view by a general maxim. When a man of charity is already there a beggar will not beg another beggar! As action is there to concord with, कारकs will not concord with fruit.

In कृदन्तs like पक्ता, पाचकs etc. कारकः or cases concord with action which appears secondary.

According to the view, सर्वं हि वाक्यं क्रियया परिसमाप्यते, 'all sentences end with action.' In भूतले घटः as semantic expectancy exists, it would be wrongly derived as असाधु or "grammatically incorrect." K has shown his disapproval for this by saying केचित्तु आह - "some say."

According to K in such usages क्रिया is supplied to complete the sense and also to remove expectancy. The भाष्य writes गमित्युक्ते कर्मनिर्दिष्टं, कर्ता क्रिया चानिर्दिष्टे - "when (the word) गम् is uttered कर्मन् (is understood) as specified, कर्तृ and क्रिया as unspecified but भूतले घटः being accepted in usage, it cannot be called असाधु or "incorrect".

Having explained about शब्दसाधुत्व or "the state of being a correct word" in the earlier two कारिकाs, now, K further speaks about the suitability of such a meaning with reference to the Navya school also.

The NKs violate Pāṇini's statement of concord of वत् with action and of नञ् also with action, but accept his statement about the use of dative in connection with स्पृह् . This is like accepting half of the hen for eating and the other half for laying eggs. "According to the NKs, in the statement पर्वतो...' the word महानस concords with पर्वत. In भूतले न घटः it is भूतलवृत्तित्वाभाववान् घटः. The अधिकरणकारक i.e. भूतले agrees with the sense of नञ् In भूतले घटः it would be भूतलाधेयत्ववान् घटः or भूतलवृत्ति घटः । भूतले concords with घटः। But these are against the rules of Pāṇini तेन तुल्यं क्रिया चेद्वतिः (p.5.5.114) "वत् concords with action alone". and कारके (p.1.4.23) "कारकs concord with action alone". Thus raising this objection against the NKs. B states that the use of स्पृहयति after पुष्पेभ्यः by the rule स्पृहेरीप्सितः (p.1.4.34) should also be dropped by the NKs. To accept Pāṇini partially is meaningless.

In this कारिका K shows how the concord of suffixes इनि etc. is also with action. K's view is as follows - गुणीभूत or secondary means is always a qualifier. In the sentence ग्रामं गतः "has gone to the village" the suffix क्त is in the sense of कर्तृ by the rule गत्यर्थ कर्मक (p.3.4.72). Now according to the view प्रत्ययार्थः प्रधानं, in कृदन्तs the meaning of the suffix is prominent. Action is secondary, still action concords with ग्रामं.

Similarly in कृतपूर्वी कटम् "a mat has been made by him previously", the suffix इनि is added in the sense of कर्तृ "agent" The secondary करण क्रिया present in the word कृत (कृतः पूर्वं कृतः अनेन) concords with कर्मन् namely कटम्. As already explained कारकs do not concord with कृत् suffixes. Hence they have to concord with secondary actions. कट being अनभिहित कर्मन् gains the second case by कर्मणि द्वितीय (p.2.3.2)

Now K assumes the following objection.

एकार्थीभावः वृत्तिः - A वृत्ति or integration conveys a collective meaning which is unified". The constituents of वृत्ति do not separately convey their individual meanings. Since गतः कृतपूर्वी etc. are वृत्तिs how can there be a concord of ग्राम etc in to the parts गम् and कृ ? This goes against the maxim पदार्थः पदार्थेनान्वेति न तु पदार्थैकदेशेन.

The commentary quotes from the V.P. in support of K's view.

सम्बन्धिशब्दः सापेक्षा नित्यं सर्वः समस्यते ।
वाक्यवत् स व्यपेक्षा हि वृत्तावपि न हीयते ॥
समुदायेन सम्बन्धो येषां गुरुकुलादिना ।
संस्पृश्वावयवान्स्ते तु युज्यन्ते तद्वता सह ॥

"A related word, when used always requires some other idea for its completion. Even when it enters a compound, this requirement, like its own meaning "is not lost." "Even if the qualifiers are connected with the compound as a whole likeगुरुकुल, it is only after being connected with the secondary parts of it that they are connected with the whole."

Thus here ग्रामं गतः has gone to the village is the दृश्टान्त - "comparison" and कृतपूर्विकटं is दार्ष्टान्त 'the compared'. The connection of the secondary action with कर्मन् in both sentences is the similarity.

The word आदि etc. refers to suffixes तुम् and त्व. In expressions like भोक्तुं पाकः, भुक्त्वा पाकः, the suffixes तुम् and त्वा concord with the गौण क्रिया "secondary action". This is from the rules -

तुमुन्ण्वुलौ क्रियायां क्रियार्थायां (p.3.4.10) and समास कर्तृकयोः पूर्वकाले (p.3.4.21)

That is, the suffixes तुम् and त्व concords with साध्यक्रिया - "action to be accomplished" present in the verbal root पच् and पाकः.

Now K explains, the fault of over application as follows : If the suffixes कृत्वसुच् etc. concord with secondary action, then, just like एकः पाकः, on the basis of the rule एकस्य सकृच्च (p.5.4.19), there will be सकृत्पाकः द्वौ पाकौ, त्रयः पाकः, चत्वारः पाकः In these expressions, the affix सुच् sets in by the rule द्वित्रिचतुर्भ्यः सुच् (p.5.4.18). Thus द्विः पाकः, त्रिः पाकः, चतुर्पाकः and then like पञ्च पाकः there would be पञ्च कृत्वः पाकः, s the suffix कृत्वसुच् sets in on the basis of the rule संख्यायाः (p.5.4.17)

According to K such expressions are welcome. Because the expressions द्विर्वचनं is used in the शास्त्र. In द्वेवचने द्विर्वचनं, the sense of the root वच् in वचनं is secondary. In the भाष्य its derivation is given as द्विः प्रयोगः द्विर्वचनः . In the word प्रयोगः, the sense of the root युज् is secondary. But in the sense of repetition the suffix सुच् sets in.

But as these expressions are not familiar they cannot b seen either in usage or in the vedas though many forms have the approval by rules of grammar, they do not come into effect, being not popular in usage. In gaining the form वचन्ति from the root वच्, there is no opposition from the rules of grammar. But it is stated by the learned as न हि वचः अन्तिपरः प्रयुज्यते - "the root वच् followed by अन्ति is not used. Hence the form वचन्ति is not in usage.

अभिधान "usage" always works as a check on grammar. Grammar cannot derive the forms which are not used. Therefore the fault of over application of a certain grammatical statement can be always removed by invoking the principle of अभिधान.

Now K refers to another view as follows -

The use of the word क्रिया in the rule संख्यायाः क्रियाभ्यावृत्तिगणने कृत्वसुच् (p.5.4.17) shows that the suffixes कृत्वसुच् and the like set in only when it is related to 'action in the process of accomplishment', like पञ्चकृत्वः पचति, द्विः पचति and the like. Expressions like सकृत्पाकः, द्विः पाकः have no scope as action conveyed in पाकः and the like are secondary and only qualifiers to घञ् and the like. The expressions द्विर्वचनम् and द्विः प्रयोगः gain सुच् being under usage and thus approved by मुनित्रय.

In this कारिका B shows how power to convey action is in the verbal root and not in the verbal suffix as stated by the MKs.

First B shows the difference between शक्तत्व 'the state of being power' and साधुत्व 'the state of being expressive'.

According to the NKs ईश्वरच्छा 'the will of God' is power. According to the GNs, बोधकतारूपः 'the state of conveying sense' is power. According to Nagesa it is वाच्यवाचकभावः 'the notion of the expression and the expressed'- 'power' is latent in the world like heat in fire, for the MKs. According to the MKs the state of being power is the same as the state of being expressive.

According to K भेद्यभेदक means the qualified and the qualifier. The difference present due to this relationship is the cause for a word being expressive. भेत्तुं व्यावृत्तियोग्यं भेद्यम्, that is विशेष्य and भिनत्ति अन्यतो व्यावर्तयति इति भेदकं, तत् is विशेषणं. In the expression नीलं कमलम् 'blue lotus' there is the exclusion of a red lotus. Hence नील is the qualifier कमल is the qualified. In नीलं कमलं there is the exclusion of a red lotus. The difference in उपाधि is the cause for शब्दसाधुत्व 'the state of being right' for a word.

The commentary writes that according to the science of grammar power is बोधकतारूप 'of the form of conveying sense'. This is based on 'भावन' 'action' being conveyed by धातु. Hence such a word is साधु 'expressive' even according to Bh. साधुत्व ज्ञान विषया सैषा व्याकरण स्मृतिः ।

'The science of grammar aims at the correctness of words'. By being the limiter of बोधजनकता 'the state of creating cognition's the meaning of the word साधु, But साधुत्व 'the state of being expressive' is not शक्तत्व 'the state of being power,' as knowledge is also gained from words that are not expressive. If there is the illusion of the congnition of भावना 'action' in verbal suffixes, then it is असाधु 'wrong'. The M.Bh. under सिद्धे शब्दार्थसम्बन्धे etc., writes समानायां अर्थावगतौ साधुभिर्भाषितव्यं, नासाधुभिरिति गम्यागम्येतिवन्नियमः क्रियते।

The meaning fixed by the science of grammar is the authority in determining साधुत्व. For eg. अश्वः means horse. Hence it is साधु in the sense of the horse only. The word अस्वः - न स्वं धनं यस्य सः is साधुः in the sense of धनहीन or 'pennyless' only. Again if the MKs say that भावना is the meaning of the verbal suffix then असाधुत्व 'the state of being inexpressive' will be the result.

If this occurs while performing a sacrifice then the कर्तृ 'agent' will accrue sin according to the rule नानृतं वदेत्.

Hence शक्तत्व is not the same as साधुत्व. Power is in the sense of action for धातु, in the sense of कर्तृ 'agent' and कर्मन् 'object' for the verbal suffix. The science of grammar is the supreme authority in grasping the meaning of power.

शक्तिग्रहो व्याकरणोपमानकोषाप्तवाक्यात् व्यवहारतश्च ।
वाक्यस्य शेषात् विवृतेः वदन्ति सान्निध्यतः सिद्धपदस्यवृद्धाः ॥

'The power of words is grasped by any one of the following means - grammar, comparison, dictionary, express assertion of a well wisher, usage of elders, context, explanation by synonyms and contiguity with a well known word.'

An objection raised by the MKs -

According to the GNs view, the statement नानृतं वदेत् in the context of दर्शपूर्णमास sacrifice, conveys पुरुषार्थ and not क्रत्वर्थ 'the sense of sacrifice' as कर्तृ 'agent' is denoted by the verbal suffix. But according to श्रुति it is क्रत्वर्थ. Therefore on the basis of the M rule शृतिलिङ्गवाक्यप्रकरणस्थानसमाख्यानां (j.m. 3.3.14) the sense of पुरुषार्थ is set aside.

According to K though the sense of the verbal suffix is कर्तृ 'agent', it is only a qualifier to the sense of धातु on the basis of Yaska's words भावप्रधानमाख्यातं 'action is prominent in a verb'. Thus according to the view गुणानां च परार्थत्वात् the prohibition refers to action and not the कर्तृ. From the context the prohibition is for the sake of sacrifice only, or

It may be stated that there is no contradiction between the two meanings, as the reference is for क्रतुयुक्त पुरुष धर्म only. This may be supported by the statement in जन्जभ्यमाणाधिकरण (p.3.4.20) in the M. In the sentence तस्माज्जन्य ….. , according to the context the rule is for the sake of sacrifice only. But the suffix शानच् in the sense of लट् conveys पुरुषार्थ.

Here the MKs have stated there is no contradiction between the two senses. Similar is the context in नानृतं वदेत् .

The MKs further argue, that, verbal cognition is a result of साधुशब्दs or expressive words. Therefore भावना is the sense of तिङ्, as there is cognition in that sense for the MKs.

K refutes the MKs in the latter half of the कारिका as follows -

Words being असाधु 'not being expressive' is not an obstacle for verbal cognition. Cognition comes through अपभ्रंश words also. Therefore according to K साधुत्व 'the state of being expressive' is not the state of being power.' This is further explained under कारिका, असाधुरनुमानेन (k.39)

End of Dhātvartha Nirṇayaḥ

लकारार्थनिर्णयः

The meaning of Lakārās

K has already described the general meaning of the ten लकारs (lakārās) in the previous chapter. In this chapter he deals with the specific meaning of each one of them.

The first कारिका gives the meaning of the six लकारs (lakarās) with ट् as इत्, namely लट्, लिट्, लुट्, लृट्, लोट् , and लेट्.

All these meanings of the lakaras are in accordance with the rules of Pāṇini (पाणिनि), for ex. वर्तमाने लट् (p.3.2.133) 'लट् is added to a root in the sense of present'; परोक्षे लिट् (p.3.3.115). लिट् is added to a root in the sense of the past before the commencement of the day and unperceived by the narrator; अनद्यतने लुट् (p.3.3.15) लुट् is added to a root in the sense of what will happen but not in the course of the current day; लृट् शेषेच (p.3.3.13) लृट् is added to a root in the remaining cases, where simple future is indicated; लोट् च (p.3.3.162) 'लोट् is added to a root in the sense of commanding, लिङर्थे लेट् (p.3.4.7) 'लेट् is added to a root in the sense of लिङ् in vedas. तिङ् etc are substitutes for लट् etc. Therefore Dar. and Par. refer to a doubt raised by the NKs about the meaning of लट् etc. as follows.

The expression लट् etc. in the sense of the present etc. cannot be correct as the power to convey meaning lies only in substitute namely तिङ् etc.

The doubt is clarified by stating that the science of grammar has enforced to impose the sense of तिङ् etc. on लट् etc. for purposes of grammatical derivation only.

But the NKs argue that it is conducive to brevity to accept power in लकारs only, otherwise the 'delimiter of power' would be 'the state of being the present' etc. conveyed by लिङ् etc. thus leading to prolixity.

According to K, this argument is refuted on two grounds. Firstly according to the M.Bh 'a word that is uttered alone conveys the meaning'. A verb is uttered with तिङ् only and not लट्.

Again by agreement the difference only on hearing the word with तिङ् the sense of the present etc. is conveyed. Hence power is in तिङ् .

The meaning of वर्तमान is now explained. Pāṇini has not defined the term वर्तमान etc. However later GNs and NKs have offered different definitions as follows -

भूतादिव्यवहारासाधारणहेतुः कालः - 'time is the special cause of the usage past etc' for the NKs.

नित्योविभुरखण्डश्च कालः - 'time is eternal, all pervading and one' for the VKs.

रजस् which stands for activity is time itself in general for the सांख्याs.

क्रियाभेदायकालस्तु - time is what distinguishes action, for the भाष्यकार.

Bh. offers several meanings '....parts of an action are naturally separated from one another and that time is their unification by the mind.'

'Time is nothing more than the different movements of the celestial bodies such as the sun, the planets the stars etc.'

'Conditioned by action time attains the states of the past, future and present - क्रियात्मकं कालम् etc.'

In all these definitions 'present' cannot be seen directly but by inference. 'Present' is the property of time.

K gives the following two definitions of वर्तमान. Sar. refers to the definition of K as follows -

प्रारब्धा चासावपरिसमाप्ता या क्रिया तदधिकरण उपलक्षितकालत्वं - 'The action which has been initiated but not finished has present for its substratum'. And also वर्तमानस्य कालगतत्वेन सर्वानुभवसिद्धत्वात् - 'it has been established by experience that present is associated with time.' Again आख्यतार्थः कालः ' the meaning of verb is time' is a well known statement.

But there is the fault of over application in the first definition of K, since the act of cooking that was going on yesterday could be referred to even today by पचति, as the definition implies क्रियाधिकरण कालः 'time having action as the substratum.' To avoid this the definition should have been शब्दप्रयोगाधिकरण कालः or 'time which is the substratum of the word uttered'.

Again there is the fault of mutual dependence in the second definition of K, as the knowledge of the present invariably needs the knowledge of the past and future and vice versa. There being no criterion to decide on anyone of them, it is said to have the fault of mutual dependence.

The commentary rejects both the definitions of K and writes- प्रयोगविशिष्टत्वं वर्तमानत्वम् 'the state of being the present is the state of being qualified by usage'.

Dar. finds the same fault with the second definition and writes that the use of वा in the कारिका is for rejection. Thus Dar. considers the first definition as having the approval of K.

How to justify these ?

The वार्तिक defines the state of being present as वर्तमानकालता आरम्भानपवर्गपर्यन्तं 'the state of being present refers to action that has commenced, till completion'. Obviously the first definition of K has its base in the वार्तिक.

M.Bh. defines वर्तमान as भूतभविष्यत्प्रतिद्वन्द्वी 'what is opposed to the past and future." Evidently the second definition of K has its base in the M.Bh.

R.K. quotes tat.dar. which argues that Pāṇini had his approval for the second definition of K, which is obvious from the order of the rules भूते (p.3.2.84), वर्तमाने लट् (p.3.2.123) and भविष्यति (p.3.3.3) on past, present and future. It also rejects the fault of mutual dependence in the definition as separate definitions could be given to the past and future without involving the present. R.K. further writes that obviously both the definitions of K have the approval of मुनित्रय and the use of वा shows popularity. But the argument of tat.dar. cannot be accepted as it is not possible to define past and future without involving the present. Hence it may be said that the statement भूतभविष्यत्प्रतिद्वन्द्वी is only a परिचायकलक्षण (a description) or a statement to familiarise the sense of the present and not its definition. Therefore the first definition may be said to have the approval of K.

Now K anticipates some doubts in the definition of वर्तमान and clarifies them.

An objection is raised by the NKs against the definition of present-In sentence like आत्मा अस्ति, पर्वताः सन्ति etc. as आत्मन् etc. are eternal there is no beginning for these actions. Then how is the use of लट् justified here ?

The objection is removed as follows - According to K, though आत्मन् is eternal, the property of birth etc. exists in the body which is the substratum of आत्मन्. If the शरीरविशिष्ठात्मा or आत्मन् as qualified by the body is considered, the use of लट् etc. becomes relevant. Even in पर्वताः सन्ति 'mountains exits', as they did exist at different times, the आत्मधारणानुकूलव्यापार or 'action' conducive to its own existence' consists of birth etc.

According to the भाष्य, time is of the form of action. Hence actio of kings and others become the substratum by temporal relation for the existence of mountains etc. According to Bh. the meaning of पच् etc. shows differently through present, past and future. But in आत्मन् etc. the present has to be understood from the actions of kings who are not eternal.

द्योतकत्व is the state of being manifestor of the meaning of the word with which it is associated वाचकत्व is the state of being expressive of the meaning of the word with which it is uttered.

Those who hold the view that लट् etc. are expressive, argue that by agreement and difference लट् etc. express the sense of present etc. This is also supported by the view प्रकृतिप्रत्ययोः प्रत्ययार्थः प्रधानं 'of the root and the suffix the meaning of the suffix is important.' Therefore power lies in लट् etc. only.

But K rejects वाचकत्व and approves of द्योतकत्व for लट् etc. for the following reasons.

If लट् etc. are taken as expressive then time becomes important in verbal cognition which is not intended. According to K, action is the chief qualificand in verbal cognition.

Moreover, by accepting the sense of the state of being a manifestor to suffixes, in words like अजा , छागी etc. instead of the qualifier namely femininity revealed by the suffixes टाप् and ङीप् gaining importance, the individual namely the qualified gains importance as desired in शाब्दबोध.

Lastly according to K, if the state of being a manifestor is accepted to suffixes, the view प्रकृतिप्रत्ययोः ..... etc. also will not be violated, as the intention is to reveal the expressed meaning only.

Now the commentary refers to another doubt raised by the NKs that according to GNs time is shown as the primary meaning of a लकार. Then the state of being the present etc. would be the secondary meaning. But it is against the rule of the भाष्य that 'a word uttered once can convey meaning only once'.

The doubt is removed by arguing that it is well established by experience that the word गंगा in गंगायां मीनघोषौ स्तः conveys the meaning of both current and bank. According to the GNs, secondary meaning is a part of the primary meaning only.

Further K. refers to another objection that according to the metarule येननाप्राप्ते यो विधिः आरभ्यते स तस्य अपवादः or 'the special rule affects the general rule.' The special meanings given to लट् etc will set aside the general meanings 'agent' etc given earlier to verbal suffixes. Thus the meaning 'agent' etc given to लकार by the rule लःकर्मणि (p.3.4.69) will be purposeless.

The objection is countered as follows - the limiter of शक्तता 'primary import' existing in the meaning is called शक्ततावच्छेकद . लत्व or the generic character of all लकाराः is the limiter of शक्तता which gives the meaning of कर्तृ 'agent'. Whereas the generic character of the लट्लकार which may be called लट्-शब्दत्व as distinct from the generic character called लत्व existing in all the लकाराs, is the limiter of the वाचकता the power of a word to express its primary meaning' namely present etc. Thus लत्व conveys 'agent' etc. and लट्त्व conveys present etc.

There are different views regarding the sense of the word अद्यतन 'of today' ?

The commentary writes that for some it is from sunrise to sunrise. According to Kaiyata it is from the third part of the previous night to the second part of the following night. The rest is अनद्यतन.

The rule परोक्षे लिट् (p.1.2.115) ordains lit. There is the extension of the rules अनद्यतने (p.3.2.111) and भूते (p.3.2.84). According to K, the state of being परोक्ष is that which is not the subject of statements like 'I can see this,' 'I saw this myself' etc. Now K, discusses about the perceptibility of action either by parts or completely.

The commentary refers to the भाष्य which says क्रियानामेयमत्यन्तापरदृष्टा or 'there is no absolute perception of any act.' Again while commenting on लट् वर्तमाने writes 'अस्ति वर्तमानकालः, परन्तु आदित्यगतिवन्नोपलभ्यते' or 'there is present tense but not realised

If लट् etc. are taken as expressive then time becomes important in verbal cognition which is not intended. According to K, action is the chief qualificand in verbal cognition.

Moreover, by accepting the sense of the state of being a manifestor to suffixes, in words like अजा , छागी etc. instead of the qualifier namely femininity revealed by the suffixes टाप् and ङीप् gaining importance, the individual namely the qualified gains importance as desired in शाब्दबोध.

Lastly according to K, if the state of being a manifestor is accepted to suffixes, the view प्रकृतिप्रत्ययोः ..... etc. also will not be violated, as the intention is to reveal the expressed meaning only.

Now the commentary refers to another doubt raised by the NKs that according to GNs time is shown as the primary meaning of a लकार. Then the state of being the present etc. would be the secondary meaning. But it is against the rule of the भाष्य that 'a word uttered once can convey meaning only once'.

The doubt is removed by arguing that it is well established by experience that the word गंगा in गंगायां मीनघोषौ स्तः conveys the meaning of both current and bank. According to the GNs, secondary meaning is a part of the primary meaning only.

Further K. refers to another objection that according to the metarule येननाप्राप्ते यो विधिः आरभ्यते स तस्य अपवादः or 'the special rule affects the general rule.' The special meanings given to लट् etc will set aside the general meanings 'agent' etc given earlier to verbal suffixes. Thus the meaning 'agent' etc given to लकार by the rule लःकर्मणि (p.3.4.69) will be purposeless.

The objection is countered as follows - the limiter of शक्तता 'primary import' existing in the meaning is called शक्ततावच्छेकद. लत्व or the generic character of all लकाराः is the limiter of शक्तता which gives the meaning of कर्तृ 'agent'. Whereas the generic character of the लट्लकार which may be called लट्-शब्दत्व as distinct from the generic character called लत्व existing in all the लकाराs, is the limiter of the वाचकता the power of a word to express its primary meaning' namely present etc. Thus लत्व conveys 'agent' etc. and लट्त्व conveys present etc.

There are different views regarding the sense of the word अद्यतन 'of today' ?

The commentary writes that for some it is from sunrise to sunrise. According to Kaiyata it is from the third part of the previous night to the second part of the following night. The rest is अनद्यतन.

The rule परोक्षे लिट् (p.1.2.115) ordains lit. There is the extension of the rules अनद्यतने (p.3.2.111) and भूते (p.3.2.84). According to K, the state of being परोक्ष is that which is not the subject of statements like 'I can see this,' 'I saw this myself' etc. Now K, discusses about the perceptibility of action either by parts or completely.

The commentary refers to the भाष्य which says क्रियानामेयमत्यन्तापरदृष्टा or 'there is no absolute perception of any act.' Again while commenting on लट् वर्तमाने writes 'अस्ति वर्तमानकालः, परन्तु आदित्यगतिवन्नोपलभ्यते' or 'there is present tense but not realised like the movement of the sun.' Therefore according to the भाष्य there is no direct perception of actions either by parts or totally. Then why include the word परोक्ष in the definition ?

Refers to an objection from the NKs against the भाष्य as follows - In प्रकृतः कटम् 'the mat is made' though only a part of the action is over, yet the completed action is imagined and the past is used by the rule भूते क्तप्रत्ययः (p.2.6.4). Similarly the perceptibility of the actions collectively is imagined on the basis of the perceptibility of the parts. Then this would be against the भाष्य that all actions are परोक्ष 'unseen'.

The commentary argues that the whole which is superimposed on the part has parts arranged in a sequence and as such it is not directly perceptible. Hence all actions are परोक्ष 'not seen'. Further substantiates from V.P.

'The parts which occur in a sequence and are partly existent and partly not so cannot enter into contact with the sense like the eyes whose objects are always the existent.' Hence the use of the word अत्यन्त in the भाष्य is very significant. As, in the sentence पश्य मृगो धावति though there is only the general knowledge of the perception of the running of the deer, the parts of action are perceived.

The commentary refers to the NKs who argue about the propriety of the word परोक्ष in the definition as follows -

It is right that the earlier and the later actions cannot be seen collectively. But the non-perceptibility of the parts of action is against experience. Because the act of putting the vessel on the stove etc are perceived. The words used in the भाष्य 'क्रियानामेयम्'

refers only to the parts of action collectively. Hence the भाष्य is not opposed to the visibility of action by parts.

It is not opposed to the V.P. also, as पारोक्ष्य or non-perceptibility refers to सदसद्समूहात्मक क्रिया - 'actions that exist and non-exist collectively' other wise the very use of सद् existence etc. cannot be justified.

Further, in पश्य मृगो धावति the word पश्य has the sense of perception only and not inference. The भाष्य has put forth only the worldly experience of the act of seeing. If not why such a reference is not made to a deer standing inside the house ? If the word धावति - 'runs' can show फल 'fruit' and not व्यापार - 'action', it cannot be called धातु.

Therefore to exclude the parts of action that are perceived directly the word परोक्ष - 'unseen' is necessary in परोक्षे लिट्. According to the view सम्भव व्यभिचाराभ्यां स्याद्विशेषणं अर्थवत् - 'A qualifier becomes significant when there is both possibility and discrepancy of a rule'. Hence no fault arises here.

According to Nagesa 'the state of being non-percetible exists in action collectively. And परोक्षत्वं च कारके विशेषणं न तु क्रियायां or 'the state of being unseen is a qualifier to the agent and not action'.

To avoid this unpleasant situation K, gives another view which says व्यापाराविष्टानां 'an agent engaged in action'.

The भाष्य reads - एवं तर्हि साधनेषु परोक्षेषु - 'if so, then, there is the non-perceptibility of agent etc. or the कारकाs.

Therefore लिट् is added to a root which expresses action that has happened in the past by the non-perceptible agent. This is the meaning of the rule परोक्षे लिट् (p.3.2.115).

Thus thought the action is not perceived directly the agent engaged in action would be both seen and unseen. When the agent engaged in cooking is being watched the sentence अयम् पपाच cannot be used. But if the agent is present and engaged in cooking is not present, अयम् पपाच is not wrong.

K raises objection against the use of लिट् in the sentence व्यातेने किरणावलीम् उदयनः. He declares it as असंगत - wrong.

But commentators differ in their opinions regarding this usage.

Subodhini writs that K has approval for the use of लिट् in other instances like -

बहुजगाद पुरस्तात्तस्य मत्ताकिलाहम् - 'intoxicated as I was, I prated in front of him.' But he is against the use of लिट् in this particular case as the composition of the word required greater presence of mind. It could not have been non-perceptible to the writer himself.

But some approve of the use of लिट् in व्यातेने on the following grounds -

In reality परोक्ष is not a condition for the use of लिट् etc. किन्तु वैवक्षिकं तत् - 'but it is based on the intention of the speaker'. It is derived as विवक्षया निर्वृत्तम् वैवक्षिकम्' । For instance, in मत्तोऽहं किल विललाप there is no actual parokṣa. But based on the intention of the speaker लिट् is used.

Again in अध्यास्त सर्वर्तु सुखामयोध्याम् - 'lived in Ayodhya which was pleasant in all seasons', though there is परोक्ष at the time of writing yet, लङ् is used instead of लिट्.

Similarly, Udayana has used लिट् to show that the work has been composed quickly without any strain, himself being unaware of it. Hence it is correct. Nagesa also writes that - चित्त विक्षेपादिना पारोक्ष्यमुपपाद्य - considering non-perceptibility due to the mind being elsewhere there is the possibility of using लिट्. But K. Bh. himself writes later as - अनद्यतनभूतत्वेन विवक्षिते लङ्, तत्रैव परोक्षविवक्षायां लिट् - लङ् is added to a root if the intention of the speaker is to convey the sense of the past before the commencement of the current day, otherwise, लिट् is added, if distant past is intended.

The meanings of लुट् and लेट् are in accordance with the sūtras of Pāṇini namely 'अनद्यतने लुट्' (p.3.3.9) 'लृट् शेषे' (3.3.13) and लिङर्थे लेट् (3.4.7) . Having decided about the meaning of the present and the past now K.Bh. discusses about the meaning of the future. His definition namely -

वर्तमानप्रागभावप्रतियोगिसमवायोत्पत्तिमात्रम् means - वर्तमानः यः प्रागभावः तत्प्रतियोगि यः समयः, तदधिकरणयोत्पत्तिमत्क्रियात्वम् - 'future is the counter - positive of the present antecendent negation and also the substratum of the state of being the action to be generated like घटः श्वः भविता . That is, the mere presence of the two halves of a pot, a stick and a wheel etc cannot result in the production of the pot. The प्रागभाव or antecedent negation of the pot should be taken into account. Once the pot is produced the antecendent negation disappears. As the cause does not exist, there is no production of the pot again. Negation too is the cause like existence - 'भावो यथा तथा अभावः कारणं कार्यवत् मतः' ।

The rule 'लिङर्थे लेट्' (3.4.7) ordains लेट् in the sense of लिङ् The sense of लिङ् is said to be in the sense of command etc. There is the extension of the word 'छन्दसि' from the rule छन्दसि लिङ् लङ्लेटः (3.4.6). Hence लेट् is used only in Vedas.

Now states the meaning of लोट् as in prayer etc. By the use of the word 'आदि' command and wish are also grasped. Such a sense comes from the rules 'लोट् च' (3.3.162) and 'आशिशि लिङ्लोटौ' (3.3.173). In the examples - भवतु ते शिवप्रसादः - 'let Śiva's favour be on you' and 'भवतु मे शिवप्रसादः' - let Śiva's favour be on me' etc. The meaning of both these two vākyas is only the sense of लिङ् According to K.Bh. the लकार s, - लेट् and लोट् are used in the sense of लिङ्. Therefore only by deciding the meaning of लिङ्, the meanings of लेट् and लोट् also would be decided.

Following the grammatical tradition, now K.Bh. deals with the four लकारs - लङ् - etc., which are called ङित् or have the letter 'ङ्' as indicatory. These meanings are in accordance with he description given by our ancient grammarians. It is stated that the affix लङ् is added to a root in the sense of 'non' 'current day,' लिङ् in the sense of prayer (command) etc, लुङ् in the sense of 'simple past' and लृङ् in the sense of 'both past and future' and in case of non-occurrence of action.

The word 'ह्यः' is not used in the general sense of yesterday, because in the general sense there will be no scope for लङ् in परह्यः

अभवत्. By लक्षण or secondary means it conveys the sense of past which is not of today. In the sentence 'अस्य पुत्रोऽभवत्' the meaning is conveyed as follows - वर्तमानध्वंस - प्रतियोगि अनद्यतन कालस्य एतत्सम्बन्धि पुत्र कर्तृकोत्पत्तेः अनुकूलव्यापारः - 'the counter positive of the destruction of the present which is the noncurrent day, is associated with the action leading to the birth of the son'.

The meaning of लिङ् is given as - 'on the basis of the rule विधि .... etcU (3.3.161); 'लिङ् is added to a root when the agent either commands, invites, permits, politely expresses a wish, asks questions or prays'. Of these vidhi is prompting. Of the six meanings लिङ् being very important this लकार is called विधिलिङ्. The Bhāṣya writes - 'विधिर्नाम प्रेरणम्' - Vidhi is prompting. Kaiyaṭa's commentary reads भृत्यादेः कस्याश्चित् क्रियायां नियोजनम् - 'to engage servants and others in some action'. The classical example of विधि is 'जलमाहर'. Example from the vedas is 'स्वर्गकामो यजेत', निमन्त्रण is to motivate a person to do a work without fail. The Bhāṣya reads - यन्नियोगतः कर्तव्यं तन्निमन्त्रणम् - nimantraṇa is that by the command of which something has to be done'.

Kaśika's commentary nyāsa writes - असत्यमपि इच्छायामकरणेसति अधर्मोत्पत्तेः अवश्यंभावेन यत्करणम् तन्निमन्त्रणम् - Even if a person is unwilling to do, as a rule he has to do it, as non-doing of the act leads to अधर्म. For example त्रीणि श्राद्धे पवित्राणि, दौहित्रः, कुतपः, तिलः - 'A daughter's son, a Brahmin and sesame are the three things sacred in śrāddha. 'Based on this statement the grandson is forced to do it without fail as - 'इह श्राद्धे भवान् भुञ्जीत इति' - 'you shall eat in this śrāddha.'

आमन्त्रण is permission for a person to do work at his will without force.

The Bhāṣya writes - आमन्त्रणम् कामचारः - 'āmantraṇa is freedom to do or not to do'.

न्यास writes - यदिच्छयैव करणम् न अनिच्छया, अकरणेपि दोषाभावात् - 'one has to do willingly and not unwillingly, as even if it not done there is nothing wrong.' For example इह आसीत् - 'you may sit here,' इह भवान् भुञ्जीत - 'you may dine here.'

अधीष्ठ is honourable request, i.e. motivate a person with respect, which means honour first and then command. For example माणवकम् अध्यापय - 'teach the student' or माणवकम् भवान् उपनयेत् - 'you accept to initiate the boy' etc.

Now he refers to an objection by the NKs regarding the meaning of लिङ्. Instead of stating separately it is brief to give प्रवर्तनात्व or the state of being the cause of motivation, as the expressed meaning of लिङ्, as it is present in all the four namely विधि etc.

The objection is countered by K.Bh by referring to the Vākhyapadīya which says - 'The sense of 'prompting' is blended in all the four, vidhi etc. Hence liṅ has to be ordained in that sense only. But they have been stated separately to derive power in the form of prompting in vidhi etc. or for the purpose of clarity, Pāṇini too has stated the four vidhi etc, in the beginning of the rule विधिनिमन्त्रण ..... etc.

Another commentary writes that according to the view विशेषधर्मव्यापकः सामान्यधर्मः - 'the general property pervades the special property'. विधित्व or the state of being the command is the special property of vidhi. And प्रवर्तनात्व - the property of being prompting is the व्यापकधर्म - 'the pervading property.' Thus for the purpose of deriving the special power in vidhi etc., and to avoid discrepancy, the meanings are given separately. प्रवर्तयते अनाया सा प्रवर्तना - 'motivates to act' by this. In स्वर्गकामो यजेत - 'one desiring heaven should perform sacrifice'. Yāga is the means to attain heaven, which is the ambition on the part of the sacrificer. Hence it is the subject. It instigates a person to act. Therefore, इष्टसाधनत्व is - प्रवर्तनात्व - 'the state of being prompting,' and it is लिङ्त्व - 'the state of being लिङ् By some प्रवर्तनात्व is argued as the meaning of लिङ्

The neo-NKs are of the view that the knowledge of कृतिसाध्यत्व or possibility of accomplishing a task is also the cause for indulging in action. Because nobody indulges in bringing down the orb of the moon or lifting a mountain whatever be the extra fruit. Hence along with इष्टसाधनत्व, कृतिसाधनत्व is also the meaning of लिङ्

The objection is countered as follows - Even though the urge to act is also due to the possibility of accomplishing the task, the result of that knowledge is also motivation to act. Moreover in sacrifice etc., everywhere that awareness comes from the world by inference. Thus as that knowledge is obtained by some other source, it cannot be the expressed meaning of लिङ्

The MK view on लिङ् as presented in the commentaries may be summed up as follows -

According to K.Bh. विधि, प्रवर्तना and प्रेरणा are synonymous terms. प्रवर्तना is called शाब्दीभावना by the MKs. The reason lies in vedic sentences, as this प्रवर्तना is not पुरुषनिष्ठ -'existing in man' but in word.

आर्थीभावना is the mental inclination existing in a person to perform the act leading to the achievement of his aim.

Bhāṭṭas do not accept व्यापार as the meaning of धातु. Hence this आर्थिभावना is the expressed meaning of लकारs in general. While in the usage of लिङ् both लिङ्त्व - 'the state of being आख्यात' and आख्यातत्व - 'the state of being आख्यात are conveyed, while only आख्यातत्व is conveyed by all other लकारs. In other words व्यापार or आर्थीभावना exists in all lakara but शाब्दीभावना exists only in the state of being लिङ् Thus it is clear that लिङ् conveys both शब्दी and आथीभावनs.

Prābhākaras say that लिङ् conveys अपूर्व (कार्य) in vedas. Hence अपूर्व is the meaning of विधि. While in classical examples कार्यताज्ञान or 'the knowledge of the state of activity' is the meaning of विधि. In the sentence - 'तृप्तिकामः पचेत' - there is no need for अपूर्वार्थ - 'special meaning'. By mere कार्यताज्ञान - 'practical knowledge,' इष्टसिद्धि - 'fulfillment of desire' results.

Being influenced by K.Bh. Nāgesa echoes his ideas in paramalaghu manjūṣā. But his own views are found in laghumanjūṣā as विधि is प्रेरणा. On hearing लिङ् etc., the invariable cognition is 'this man is urging me to do.' Hence -

शब्दनिष्ठतया शाब्दीभावना, शाब्दभावनया या प्रवृत्तिः फलोत्पत्तये भवति सैवार्थी भावना । Dar.

प्रेरणा is the synonym of प्रवर्तना. Thus the प्रयोजकनिष्ठव्यापार or action existing in the words of the speaker is the sense of लिङ् and not इष्टसाधनत्व of the state of being the means for the fulfillment of desire'. Thus in worldly usage action exists in the words of the speaker and in vedas it exists in God. As the basis for such motivation is 'word' it is called शाब्दीभावना - or 'action based on word.'

The NKs object that, one is motivated by the attainment of the desirable, but one may as well be motivated by the avoidance of the undesirable, because in a tasty meal mixed with poison (as there is grater danger in the form of death there is no प्रवृत्ति - 'inclination to act'.

According to K.Bh. this objection fails as intense desire motivates a person to act due to the absence of any serious unpleasantness.

It is stated by Mandana Misra - except being the means of fulfilling desire, there is no other motivation for the actions of men. Hence they say 'prompting' is the property and cause of 'activity'. This is elaborately discussed in the Vaiyākaraṇa Bhusaṇasāra.

Nāgeśa substantiates his view from the Bhāṣya that in राज्ञाप्रवर्तितोऽहम् - "I am prompted to act, by the king' - प्रवर्तकपुरुषनिष्ठैवशालिन् शक्या - 'the sense of लिङ् exists only in the words of the king who urges to act. Hence इष्टसाधनत्व is neither conveyed by it nor exists in it. This has already been refuted by K.Bh.

By the word आदि in प्रेरणादि, the meanings namely - 'to wish for' and 'the cause-effect notion' etc stated by the rules - 'liṅ is optionally added to roots which express the condition and its consequence' (p.3.3.156) and 'liṅ and loṭ are added to a root by which benediction is intended' (p.3.3.173) or grasped. Like 'if a man tries to kill a Brāhmin', he shall be punished for hundred years' and 'let God's grace be on you'.

The other examples are 'चिरं जीव्यात् भवान्' - 'may you live long'. For हेतु and हेतुमत् 'cause and effect' the example is 'if he calls Kamalaka, the cart will not be in disorder.' संप्रश्न means, a question like किं वेदमधीयीत उत व्याकरणमिति - 'sir, what shall I learn, Veda or grammar?'

प्रार्थना is a request for what one wants. For example 'भोजनं लभेय इति, this is my prayer that I should get food'.

Now explains the sense of the past tense as follows - past is the meaning in general from the rule लुङ् (3.2.110), by extending the rule भूते (3.2.54). Here the state of being the past is - विद्यामानो यो ध्वंसस्तप्रतियोगित्वमिति- 'the state of being the counter positive of the destruction at present'. The destruction at present is of the past action. This past action being the condition, the idea is in the time which was its substratum or घटोत्पत्तिजनकव्यापारकालोध्वस्त इति or 'the time of the action leading to the creation of the pot is destroyed'. Hence, there is the usage 'घटः अभूत्' - when the pot exists.

In घटो नष्टः the reference is to the destruction of the time in which the pot was created.

The cognition is - 'action conducive to creation etc. being the substratum of a thing, identical with the pot which is the counter positive of destruction at present'

This is summary - Time is of two kinds, as 'of to day' and 'not of today.' The first is of three kinds as 'past, future and present'. The other is of two kinds as 'past (not of today) and future, not of to-day.' Of these लट् is used to convey 'the state of being the present', लुट् only, 'in the state of being the past' and लृट् only to show future.

The state of being past is विद्यमानो यो ध्वंसस्तत्प्रतियोगित्वमिति - 'the state of being the counter positive of the destruction at present'. The destruction at present is of the past action, this past action being the condition. The idea is in the time which was its substratum or घटोत्पत्तिजनकव्यापारकालो ध्वस्त इति - 'the time of the action leading to the creation of the pot is destroyed'. "Hence here is the usage घटः अभूत् when the pot exists. In घटो नष्टः the reference is to the destruction of the time in which the pot was created.

When the intention is to show special meanings such as, 'cause effect relation' etc. लृङ् is used. If the 'past' not of today is intended लङ् is used. But if unperceived past is intended then लिट् is used in the place of लङ्, लुट् is used with reference to future not of today.

The meaning of लृङ् is stated as सत्यां etc. क्रियायाः अतिपत्तिः means - 'when the non-production of the action is understood' both in the sense of past and future. When there is the cause -effect notion लृङ् is used. This is understood from the rule लिङ् निमित्ते लृङ् क्रियातिपत्तौ (3.3.139) - 'when there is reason for affixing लिङ्, the affix लृङ् is added in future tense, when the non-occurrence of action is to be understood. The cause of लृङ् being the cause-effect notion etc. as in 'if there had been good rain, then there would have been plenty of food.' ' If the fire had burnt bright, the rice would have been cooked' etc. The rule भूते च (3.3.140) ordains लृङ् in the past tense and in the above senses except in future. Thus in लृङ् there is non-performance of action, cause effect notion and also super-imposition or अपादान.

The rules like - 'लट् in the sense of present' etc. are only examples. लकारs have been ordained in different senses like अर्ह, प्रशंसा, प्राप्तकाल etc. But लट् having power in the sense of the present is well known. The rest are secondary senses according to the NKs and MKs. But in all the above sense it is 'power' only for the grammarians, who hold बोधकत्व as power. अनुबन्ध is the indicatory letter. The rule for the order of the लकारs is according to the order of letters only. Hence, लेट् is referred to as the fifth लकार by the MKs.

The purpose of using the word दिक् is - In the absence of the suffixes तिप् etc., it is not possible to say whether it has the state of expressing or manifesting the sense, as such there is no awareness of being present, past etc. Hence word is the expression. The state of being expressive is super imposed on the word, to create power in it. In the absence of either the stem or the suffix, it has to be supplied, to gain the meaning of the word, according to the maxim - शिष्यमाणं लुप्यमानार्थाभिधायी -'whatever remains expresses the sense of the missing portion. Here in examples like व्यतिशे, इह, इयान् though only the suffixes are seen, the sense of the stem is also understood. This is for guidance.

End of लकारार्थनिर्णय.

सुबर्थनिर्णयः

Meaning of case endings

After discussing the meanings of the root and the verbal endings K discusses the meanings of the case ending, because the action which is conveyed by a root has an expectancy for different kārikās such as कर्तृ, कर्म etc. The word कारक means action on the basis of its derivation कृ with ण्वुल् as that is the action which causes the signs कर्तृ, कर्म etc. Of the seven cases in Sanskrit, only six cases concord with action. The Karika - 24 of Dixita enumerates different meanings of these cases in the light of Bhāṣya i.e. substratum, limit, goal, relation or power itself are respectively the meanings of cases. The Vārtika on सुपां कर्मादयोऽप्यर्थाः (1.4.21) is referred to as सुपां कर्मेति भाष्यतः in the present कारिका. Actually the Bhāṣya on this vārtika reads सुपां संख्या चैवार्थः कर्मादयश्च. Therefore it would have been more appropriate to say सुपां कर्मेति वार्तिकात् ।

Following the Bhāṣya, K gives substratum as the meaning of the second, third and the seventh cases, and debates over it.

The NKs rise objection against the meaning of कर्मन्. It is argued that the definition कर्तुरीप्सिततमं कर्म (1.4.49) refers to कर्म as the object most desired of the agent, substratum cannot be the meaning of the second case which denotes कर्म.

The objection is removed by arguing that the word ईप्सित in the rule is not used in its conventional sense but in its derivative sense, namely, 'that which is most desired to obtained'. Since the word कर्तुः is used in the genitive denoting agent, the expression

कर्तुरीप्सिततमम् means 'that which is most desired to be obtained by the agent'.

It is further pointed out that the root आप् denotes connection in general. Moreover the meanings of the desiderative and the the suffix तपम् are not intended.

Thus according to the commentary ईप्सिततम simply means सम्बद्धम् - 'connected'. The meaning thus arrived at has an expectancy for an instrument. केन सम्बद्धम् ? - ' connected by what?' The word कर्तृः present in the rule implies that this connection is through the action of the कर्तृ . The connection is again of the form of creation (जन्यता) and substratum of creation. The Karman is that कारक which is connected with the action denoted by the verb, by the agent through the relation of creation or of substratum of creation by means of his own action. Thus both फल, i.e. विक्लित्ति and फलाश्रय gain कर्मसंज्ञा through the relation of creation and substratum of creation. The meaning क्रियाजन्यफलाश्रयः emerges from the Pāṇinian definition कर्तुरीप्सिततमम् ।

Tattvadarṣinī writes - अत्राप्नोतेः सम्बद्धमात्रमर्थः ... तथाचेप्सितमित्यस्य सम्बद्धमित्यर्थः - सम्बन्धश्चात्र ..... जन्यतारूपः, जन्याश्रयतारूपश्च, एवञ्च कर्ता स्वनिष्ठव्यापारेण जन्यत्वजन्याश्रयत्वान्यतर सम्बन्धेन सम्बद्धम् कारकम् कर्मसंज्ञम् स्यादिति सूत्रार्थः सम्पद्यते ।

Another objection is raised that, if a Karman is क्रियाजन्यफलाश्रय according to Pāṇini, then, why did he not define karman as such?

The objection is removed by arguing that - in that case the rule वारणार्थानामीप्सितः (1.4.27) would be an exception. In the sentence अग्नेः माणवकं वारयति - 'Holds the boy from fire', ablation would have set in after माणवक also. To avoid this, the word ईप्सिततम- 'most desired' had to be included in the rule. To avoid non-pervation of the definition in words showing the sense of 'hatred' and 'indifference' he gave the rule तथायुक्तश्चानीप्सितम् । (1.4.50) later.

K.Bh. points out that it is more appropriate to define karman as कर्तृजन्यक्रियासंबद्धम्, because such a definition can also cover अनीप्सित and अकथितकर्मs which are defined by Pāṇini in the rule तथायुक्तञ्चानीप्सितम् and अकथितञ्च (1.4.51). This is thus the definition common to all types of karma mentioned by Pāṇini. He further says that the meaning of the words ईप्सिततमम् and अनीप्सित which are mentioned in the definition are not understood in the verbal cognition.

The commentary, Tat.Dar. very aptly describes the presence of these words in the definition as स्वरूपतःसत्ता - 'presence in its own form.' Just as in the process of the creation of a pot, a danda-stick is the cause by its presence in its own form, in the same manner these two words define karma by their mere presence in the rules of definition.'

Now he shows the fault of आनन्त्य -'being infinite' in connection with the meaning 'substratum' for the second, third and seventh cases. Since the substratum of each action is different, there will be no delimitor of substratum. There will be as many substrata as the number of actions. This will lead to the fault of infinity. Substratum cannot be therefore accepted as the meaning of these cases. The objection is removed as follows -

However if indivisible power is accepted then there is no prolixity. Though there is difference in their meanings while in continuous usage as āśraya, āśraya .... there is only one property namely the state of being the substratum.

After establishing substratum as the meaning of the second case, K.Bh. shows with the help of illustration how a karman of an action denoted by a verb like पचति and जानाति is a substratum.

In the sentence घटं जानाति - 'knows a pot', ghaṭa, 'pot' is the karman, because it is the substratum of the meaning of the root ज्ञा namely 'आवरणभङ्ग' - 'breaking of the cover'.

The commentary refers to this as the cover on the object of knowledge. In other words it is the cover of ignorance in which an object is wrapped and 'to know' means 'to remove the cover'. In this connection almost all commentaries raise the question about आवरणभङ्ग as the meaning of the root ज्ञा. If this meaning is accepted and of आवरणभङ्ग belongs to the object, knowledge would co-exist with the object of knowledge. For instance knowledge of घट will exist as long as घट exists. There cannot be knowledge of घट which existed in the past or which will exist in future. Therefore one cannot say घटं आजानम् or घटं ज्ञास्यामि. On the contrary a wrong expression like यथापूर्वम् घटं न जानामि - 'I do not know the pot as before' would be used.

K.Bh. assumes this objection and replies that although pot or any object does not exist in the past or future, आवरणभङ्ग is there. That is why आवरणभङ्ग is understood as the meaning of the root ज्ञा.

If आवरणभङ्ग is the meaning of ज्ञा, how to explain that the pot which did not exist in the past or 'will not' in the future as the substratum of आवरणभङ्ग.

K.Bh. answers this question - Just as the NKs accept that a pot which existed in the past can become a substratum of the knowledge through its being object of knowledge, in the same manner the grammarians also can claim that the non-existing pot can be substratum of आवरणभङ्ग through its being an object of आवरणभङ्ग.

K.Bh. offers another solution to this problem by referring to the सत्कार्यवाद, the statements in the upaniṣads such as सदेवसौम्येदमग्र आसीत् etc. imply that the effect exists in the cause before its coming into being. In other words there is no absolute destruction of any object in this world. When it ceases to exist for us, actually it exists in its cause. The सत्कार्यवाद is propounded by the sānkhyās.

असदकरणदुपादानग्रहणात्सर्वसम्भवाभावात् ।
शक्तस्य शक्यकरणात्कारणाभावाच्च सत्कार्यम् ॥

It means, 'effect subsists even prior to the operation of the cause. For, that which does not exist cannot be by any means brought into existence and the effect is not different from he cause? K.Bh. further quotes Bhartrhari to support this view - 'when the disappearance of the objects is perceived, the same existence becomes non-existence. If the disappearance is gradual it is perceived that object is being destroyed.'

But the NKs object - In the sentence चैत्रः ग्रामं गच्छति and प्रयागतः काशीं गच्छति the contact being द्विष्ट - 'present in both' it exists in chaitra also. Again contact produced by action is in काशी and separation is in प्रयाग. Hence कर्मसंज्ञा-'object sign' should set in, on both चैत्र and प्रयाग.

The above argument is countered as follows -

Well chaitra being the substratum of the action leading to contact, will have the agent sign also. But by the governing rule आकरडारादेका संज्ञा (11.4.1) that only one sign is to be understood upto आकडारा ..... and again by the rule विप्रतिषेधे परं कार्यम् (1.4.2) the agent sign being the subsequent prevails. The rule for adding case endings is based on the agent and object signs, specially ordained in grammar. Thus the concourse of two different signs is avoided.

The NKs raise an objection as - though the object sign is set aside by the agent sign, as there is the object sign originally in chaitra, the second case ending will set in.

The objection is removed by saying that without considering the agent sign if the second case is created then mistakes occur in well known usages in the world. In the sentence पाचयति कृष्णेन though there is object sign for कृष्ण originally, as it is set aside by the agent sign the third case ending has set in. The NKs defend their stand as follows -

The rule गतिबुद्धि (1.4.52) ordains the second case affix, when the sense is 'to move' etc. there by showing words after which the second case affix is not desired. Therefore the second case affix will not set in after Krishna.

To avoid the cognition of chaitra as both the agent and the object, K.Bh. offers an other method of expressing the verbal cognition as shown above. To avoid the object sign for प्रयाग in the above sentence, the qualifier, being the meaning of the root is appended to the definition of the fruit.

Now, he refers to the view of the Neologicians who disapprove of this definition on the following grounds -

In शब्देन्दुशेखर while commenting on the rule - ध्रुवमपायेऽपादानम् (1.4.29), in the sentence प्रयागात् काशीं गच्छति - 'separation' is also shown as the meaning of the root 'गम्' to gain ablation sign in प्रयागात्. Therefore the inclusion of the qualifier - 'being the meaning of the verbal root' does not solve the problem.

According to the noe-logicians, the qualifier फलतावच्छेदक सम्बन्धेन - 'by the relation of the delimiter of the state of being the result' will be able to overcome the above fault.

फलतावच्छेदक सम्बन्ध is the relation by which the agent wishes the fruit to exist as a qualifier in its substratum. This relation differs from root to root. In ग्रामं गच्छति the fruit of the form of contact present in ग्राम is by intimate relation. This relation alone is the limitor of the state of being the fruit. Otherwise as contact is द्विष्ट - 'present in both', even chaitra will get the object sign.

The commentary writes that - similarly in the sentence ग्रामं त्यजति the प्रतियोगित्वविशिष्टसमवायसम्बन्ध -'intimate relation qualified by the state of being the counter positive' is the limitor of the state of being the fruit. In ग्रामात् विभजते there is अनुयोगित्वविशिष्टसमवायसम्बन्ध - 'intimate relation qualified by the state of being the subject'. Therefore though the roots 'त्यज्' and विभज् imply the same fruit there is no object sign for ग्रामात् in ग्रामात् विभजते.

In the sentence तण्डुलं पचति etc., - 'let rice be the substratum of softening by intimate relation' is the wish of the agent. Here the state of being the limitor of the state of being the subject is in he fruit. By this definition, though time is also the substratum of the fruit namely softening time will not gain the object sign, as it does not exist with the substratum by intimate relation.

But according to K.Bh. and the ancient grammarians, such a meaning is available in the rule itself given by Pāṇini. This is substantiated from Kaiyaṭa's work that the word ईप्सित in the rule shows the desire of the agent in the state of being the substratum of the fruit. The sense of the superlative affix तमप् would be - 'if the most desired fruit agrees with the sense of the verbal root concerned'.

Moreover, विभाग or separation is not the meaning of the root 'गम्' but 'contact created by action'. Hence, the word प्रयाग will not gain the object sign.

Now K.Bh. discusses about the definition of Karman according to the NKs.

'पर' means a 'कारक' or case other than कर्म. समवेतत्व means, action present by the state of being in intimate relation - 'परसमवेतत्व क्रियाजन्य फलाश्रयत्वम्' - 'the state of being the substratum of the fruit produced by action having the state of being in intimate relation with the other, namely the agent' is the definition.

In the sentence चैत्रः चैत्रं गच्छति action being present in chaitra by intimate relation, it can never be karman. Hence the first fault is avoided according to the MKs.

Again, in the sentence 'प्रयागात् काशीं गच्छति' - according to the NKs, the state of being the karman is the state of being the fruit limited by the state of being the sense of धातु. Here the meaning conveyed would be - "I am the substratum of contact with काशी being the desire of the agent and प्रयाग not being his aim will never gain the state of being the karman.

Now K.Bh. criticises the definition offered by the NKs on three grounds.

(1) Firstly, by the qualifier 'परसमवेतत्व' even if the sentence चैत्रः चैत्रं गच्छति could be avoided, it gives rise to the wrong sentence 'पाचयति कृष्णं गोपः' like 'गमयति कृष्णं गोकुलम्'. Because, Krishna being employed by Gopa becomes the substratum of the act of softening, which is also the meaning of धातु.

The NKs would defend this by saying that the rule गतिबुद्धि (1.4.52), except the roots listed in गतिबुद्धि in the case of causal roots, object sign will not set in after the 'employed' - this explains about 'कर्मसंज्ञाविवक्षा' i.e. where the object sign is not intended. But the rule of creating case affixes should be विवक्षा or specific injunction. Hence the second case ending will not set in after Krishna.

(2) Secondly, in 'तण्डुलः पच्यते स्वयमेव' the अग्निसंयोग - 'contact of fire' present in काष्ठ being different from rice exists by intimate relation with rice, which is the substratum of the result and helps softening through contact by fire. Hence the second case ending will not set in after तण्डुल. But the अग्निसंयोग or 'contact of fire' will be the meaning of the root ''पच्'. Therefore it is wrong. अग्निसंयोगः पच् धात्वर्थेति मतेऽयं दोषः.

(3) Lastly, he explains that if परसमवेतत्व is accepted then many cause effect relationships will have to be shown like परत्व - 'otherness' in the action which is the meaning of the root, and the sense of the second case in the state of being the other, which is the substratum and the fruit is limited by being the sense of the root etc. leading to prolixity (एवञ्च कर्मलक्षणे परत्वस्य, तल्लक्षणे इतरत्वस्य च निवेशात् गौरवं स्पष्टमेव)

This karman is of seven kinds. According to Bhaṛtrhari, Karman is of two kinds as ईप्सिततम - 'the most desired' and अनीप्सित - 'not desired'. Of the two, the first is of three kinds as निर्वर्त्य - 'to be accomplished', विकार्य - 'to be modified' and प्राप्य - 'attainable or inferred'. The second is of four kinds. 'That gained by indifference.' that not desired by the agent' and 'that not specified by any other symbol' and 'all those preceded by something else' (उपसर्ग etc.) This is from Vākyapadīya. Pāṇini's rule तथायुक्तञ्चानीप्सितम् (1.4.50) ordains the object sign for द्वेष्य or 'object of aversion' and औदासीन्य - 'object' of indifference.' The rule 'अकथितं च' (1.4.51) ordains object sign on words 'not specified by any other sign'. The rules 'अधिशीङ्स्थासां कर्म' (1.4.46) and क्रुधद्रुहूईर्ष्या... (1.4.38) ordain कर्मसंज्ञा for all those preceeded by preposition.

Now these seven kinds of कर्म are explained. निर्वर्त्यकर्म is defined by Bhartrhari as यदसज्जायते - 'that which did not exist is born'. An accomplished object has its origin in special effort. निर्वर्त्यते निष्पाद्यते यत् तन्निर्वर्त्यम् - 'whatever is made to manifest, like, घटं करोति - 'he makes the pot'.

विकार्यकर्म is प्रकृत्युच्छेद- where the original is either destroyed or modified. This is also has its origin in special effort. Well then, there is over application in the definition of निर्वत्यकर्म. Bhaṛtrhari gives another explanation to overcome this fault.

सतीवा विद्यमाना वा प्रकृतिः परिमाणिनी ।
यस्य नाश्रियते तस्य निर्वर्त्यत्वं प्रचक्षते ।
प्रकृतेस्तु विवक्षायां विकार्यं कैश्चिदन्यथा ॥

'That is called 'nirvartya' in which the original of the modified object is seen but not referred to, if the modification of the original is the view (of the speaker) it is vikārya, (thus) is stated by some.'

निर्वत्य - 'to be accomplished' is that which being non-existent comes into existence and manifests by its birth. Here the original of the modified object is seen but not referred to. It is like घटं करोति. विकार्य - 'modified object' is of two kinds. Some resulting from the destruction of the original form like ash from sticks and some by producing objects in altered form like modified gold etc. in the form of ornaments. It means एकस्य विवक्षाभेदेन उभयरूपत्वेन व्यवहारः - 'due to the difference in the view of the speaker the same object is referred to by two different expressions.

But this karika of Bhartrhari is not quoted by K.Bh. Therefore there is difference in the interpretation of the text by commentators which may be summed up as follows -

According to the commentary "Sarala' - विकार्यकर्म is denoted by प्रकृति विनाश - 'destruction of the original' and गुणान्तरोत्पत्या -'by having produced a different property', both भस्म and कुण्डल become विकार्यकर्मs. The idea of विवक्षा is given as 'अन्येतु' as another view like - प्रकृत्योः परिणामत्वेन विवक्षायां भस्मकुण्डले कर्मणो विकार्ये, if the intention is to express the modification in its original form then it is विकार्य, if that is not the विवक्षा then it is निर्वर्त्यकर्म, only'. Thus, what the speaker intends to express is important in deciding about it.

But according to the derivation of the words the meanings would be निष्पादनार्थं घटादिकर्मनिर्वर्त्यम् - 'whatever is fit to be brought about, घट etc. is 'accomplished karman' and विपूर्वक कृञः विकारार्थम्' - whatever is suitable for modification is modified karman. And they are काष्ठ etc. only. Hence the property of being विकार्यकर्म is for काष्ठ and सुवर्ण, where as भस्म and कुण्डल have the property of निर्वर्त्य only according to Kaunḍa Bhaṭṭa. Hence, there is no fault of over application in the definition of विकार्यकर्मन् as pointed out by darpaṇakāra. The explanation given by darpaṇa is another view and not the view of K.Bh. is clearly seen. The explanation given by सरला settles all doubts.

प्राप्यकर्म is said to be that in which there is no special effect due to action but noticed by either perception or inference. For example, in the sentence, चैत्रः सुखं अनुभवति by viewing the signs of satisfaction expressed on the face, chaitra's joy is inferred. Other examples are, 'perceives the pot' and touches grass, is indifference. "Consumes poision'is hatred. Milks the cow' is 'what is not specified' by other symbols (or कारकs), 'gets angry at the cruel man' is preceded by the preposition.

'Substratum' is the meaning of the agent in the third case affix. That means 'the agent is independent'. Independence is the state of being the substratum of action which is the meaning of the verbal root.

'The state of being the agent is always desired in a karaka whose action is specified by the root'. This is from vākyapadīya. Therefore, when action of anything (or any person) is specified by the root then that is the agent. For example, 'the pot cooks'. 'Fire cooks,' 'the sticks cook', 'rice cooks by itself' etc are approved.

The above definition of तृतीया is based on Pāṇini's rule स्वतन्त्रः कर्ता (1.4.54) - 'whatever the speaker chooses as the independent source of action is called कर्तृ - 'agent'. The word independent has a technical meaning here -स्वतन्त्रपदमत्रैतदर्थे पारिभाषिकमिति तत्त्वम्. The third case ending is ordained by कर्तृकरणयोस्तृतीया (23.6.62). In denoting the agent or the instrument the third case affix is added.

According to K.Bh. the agent is one whose action is intended to be the meaning of the root. Therefore विवक्षा is very important. When the action of the fuel is considered as the meaning of the root पच्, then the sentence काष्ठेन पचति is obtained. The M.bh. writes विवक्षातः कारकाणि भवन्ति - 'kārakās are created with reference to the view point of the speaker'. The vākyapadīya writes -

धर्मैरभ्युद्यतैः शब्दे नियमो न तु वस्तुनि ।
कर्मत्वं करणत्वं च कर्तृत्वंचोपजायते ॥

Thus the states of being a कर्तृ , कर्म etc are created by the differentiation present in the mind of the speaker.

While explaining the meaning of स्वतन्त्रः कर्ता under कारके (1.4.23) even Patanjali says - एवं तर्हि स्थालीस्थे यत्ने कथ्यमाने स्थाली स्वतन्त्रा ।

कर्तृस्थे यत्ने कथ्यमाने परतन्त्रा - 'if so, sthali is independent with reference to action in it and dependent with reference to action in the कर्तृ, यत्सर्वेषु साधनेषु सन्निहितेषु कर्ता प्रवर्तयिता भवति - 'since he motivates all the accessories which are ready on hand to do their work'.

The objection for this being - if vivakṣā is the rule for creating case affixes, then the decision taken by vyasa in the rule कर्मकर्तृ .... (1.2.4) etc. cannot be justified. Because by the word एतम्, jīva - 'self' is clearly shown as the object. But by तिङ् in अभिसम्भवितास्मि, jīva - 'self' cannot be both agent and object at the same time. According to grammarians the object sign for jīva - 'self' is set aside by the agent sign by the rule - आकडारादेकासंज्ञा (1.4.1). Moreover, in object agent usage the affixes यक् etc have to set in.

According to K.Bh. the objection does not stand, as the reference to the agent and object signs is for व्यवहारसंज्ञा - 'practical purposes'. There is no basic difference between the two.

The property of being both the agent and the object by विवक्षा is already shown in examples like पच्यते तण्डुलः स्वयमेव.

According to vākyapadīya it is आरोपात् कर्तृत्व व्यवहारः - 'the usage of the state of being the agent is due to super imposition'. While in the case of jīva - 'self', it is useful in showing the difference between उपास्य - 'the worshipped' and उपासक - 'the worshipper'. So Vyāsa has no objection against the self having two symbols as the same time.

Because of the complications explained in the text, 'एतम्' will not gain the second case affix. Therefore the difference in meaning due to विवक्षा helps to resolve the doubt as to when जीव - 'self' should be agent or object.

Thus, according to K.Bh., कर्तृ - 'agent' is intended to be the substratum of action, which is the meaning of the root. The meaning namely 'action' as an adjective to the agent is obtained by the root itself. Hence 'substratum' not gained by any other source is the sense of तृतीया.

K.Bh. refers to two other definitions. कारकचक्रप्रयोक्तृत्वम् the property of employing the cycle of कारकाs means कृत्याश्रयत्वम् - 'the property of being the substratum of the effort'. In that case another doubt is raised as follows - कर्तृ - 'agent' is the substratum of कृति or effort leading to action, which is also the meaning of the root. But कृति or effort being the property of sentious objects, there is non-pervasion of the definition of karman in non-sentious objects like stick, chariot etc. Moreover, कृति is not action which is the meaning of the root. It is only यत्नविशेष or special effort seen in the agent.

The doubt is cleared as follows - According to K.Bh. the definition कारकचक्र प्रयोक्तृत्वं कर्तृत्वम् has the approval of the भाष्यकार In sentious objects there is natural prompting and in non-sentious objects there is super imposed prompting. Therefore there is no non-pervasion of the definition in usages like दण्डः करोति, भिक्षावासयति etc. But कृति or effort is not the meaning of तृतीया as it has already been gained by the verbal root.

कर्तृ or agent is of three kinds. 'Pure' or 'independent', 'promoter' - being the cause and as 'object agent'. Examples -

According to K.Bh. in मया हरिः सेव्यते, मया is the independent agent. Substratum is the meaning of the third case ending in मया. It agrees with action which is the meaning of the root.

In कार्यते हरिणा or हरिः कार्यते, the suffix णिच् has set in after कृ. Hence it is in passive where the employed agent or the cause gains the third case ending.

In the sentence गमयति कृष्णं गोकुलम्, Krishna is the employed agent. But Krishna is of object - agent form - कर्मकर्तृरूप.

According to ancient grammarians in all the above usages, action is the chief qualificand in verbal cognition. But the neo-grammarians hold action in active and fruit in passive, as the chief qualificands of verbal cognition.

Substratum and action are the meanings of the instrumental third case ending. Accordingly 'that which is specially auxiliary in the accomplishment of the action is called करण -'instrument'. The sense of तमप् is 'most important'. The means, action having the property of producing result without any interruption. The cause which has that kind of an action is the instrument.

An objection is raised by the NKs against the definition of करणतृतीया as follows - As the sense of action is gained from the verbal root let the instrumental third case ending stand for the sense of substratum.

The objection is removed by saying that - though the meaning namely 'action' is gained from the verbal root, the knowledge of प्रकृष्टव्यापार - 'the most important action' present in करण - instrument, if not expressed by word, it cannot be stated in verbal cognition also. Hence it is necessary to accept power in 'action' also for करणतृतीया - 'instrumental third case'.

It is further argued that Pāṇini's rule - साधकतमं करणम् (1.4.49) defines करण. The affix तमप् has the sense of प्रकर्षा - 'extra ordinary'.

As the affix is used after साधक which expresses कारक in general, the meaning would be, in view of other करणs. Therefore the sentences - तेन अश्वेन दीपिकया व्रजति and रामेण बाणेन हतो वाली are accepted. It is stated in the vākyapadīya that -

'The action after which the manifestation of result is intended, is called करण - 'instrumental cause'. That cannot be indicated (object wise) as object (or Vastu itself), if not a specified object. Because the intention to express is only seen. for e.g. 'cooking is done by the pot'.

Now the word विवक्ष्यते - 'intended to be stated' shows that depending on the wish of the speaker all kārikās become करणs. If there is no करणत्वविवक्षा, there is scope for the second and seventh case affixes. It means though all kārakas can become करणs, yet if there is some other कारक in view, on the basis of the respective specified meanings, the तृतीया will not set in after them.

क्रियायाः means फलस्य - 'of the fruit'. The meaning of the verbal root is ...... or 'action in the process of accomplishment'. According to the derivation क्रियते उत्पद्यते या सा क्रिया' 'Fruit' is also called क्रिया

In वस्तुतः the affix तस् has been added in the sense of सप्तमी as वस्तुनि like गोत्व etc. As the individual is not specified, it is not possible to decide a particular object as करण. In sentences like स्थाल्या पच्यते, though स्थाली is confirmed to be the अधिकरण, yet as the intention is not in that sense, the state of being the instrument is shown. In case it is not desired then the sentence would be ओदनं स्थाल्यां पचति.

The NKs object that, if all kārikās become करण s then a contradiction arises in the उत्तरमीमांसाधिकरण in the context of the Brahmasūtra कर्ताशास्त्रार्थवत्वात्. (2.33.33). अधिकरण is defined as एकार्थप्रतिपदाकन्यायसमुदायः - 'a group of maxims helpful to convey fixed meanings for words used in scriptures. Each अधिकरण has पञ्चाङ्गs or five parts like विषय, संशय, पूर्वपक्ष, सिद्धान्त and निर्णय.

Here, having decided जीव - 'self' as the agent for purposes of शास्त्र, then, the rule शक्तिपिपर्ययात् is quoted to show that 'ego consciousness' can never become the agent. If विज्ञान or 'ego consciousness' becomes कर्तृ 'agent', then the state of being karman for it will be set aside. But जीव - 'self' indulges in actions by the dictates of बुद्धि or विज्ञान. In this way बुद्धि is always करण or instrument. But if बुद्धि is given the sense of 'agent' else where there would be reversal of the sense of करण.

The NKs object as follows - Well, according to grammarians there is no opposition between the states of being either agent or instrument due to विवक्षा or the special view point of the speaker. The same entity can become either the agent or instrument as in sentences like काष्ठैः स्थाल्यां पचति and काष्ठः पचति etc., hence the rule शक्तिविपर्ययात् becomes redundant.

This may be cleared by saying that the idea of the text is, if विज्ञान or ego consciousness considered as करण in one श्रुति becomes agent in another श्रुति, it results in reversal of power. Hence, it is to be treated as unauthentic. But it does not rule out two powers for the same entity.

The commentary 'sarala' writes that , as there is no contradiction in having the sense of instrument in one श्रुति and the sense of agent in the other, this discussion on 'reversal of power' should be ignored. According to darpaṇa the word अभ्युच्चय has another reading as अन्वाचय which means - अन्यतरस्य आनुषङ्गित्वे अन्वाचयः - 'the fault of setting aside the power of a word concerned'.

According to K.Bh. this point is made clear in the Bhāṣya itself under the chapter यथाचतक्षोभायथा. (Brah.2.3.40) and explained clearly in बृहद्भूषण. Here the intention of the rule is to show that जीव - 'self' is a conditional agent and not the real agent. Hence the importance is not for the discussion on reversal of powers. Thus the contradiction is cleared.

According to K.Bh. the state of being the substratum is the sense of the seventh case by the rule सप्तम्यधिकरणे च (23.3.36). It is used in he sense of location by the rule - आधारोऽधिकरणम् (1.4.45) - 'that in which action is located is called substratum'. As substratum has the expectancy in the superstratum, action revealed, by the governing rule कारके becomes the superstratum. Then he sense of सप्तमी would be क्रियाश्रय - 'substratum of action'. As action is the meaning of the verbal root 'substratum' alone is accepted as the meaning of the seventh case.

The commentary writes the following objection from the NKs and replies -

If locations of all actions gain the substratum symbol, then there is over application of the definition in चैत्र, तण्डुल and बाण which are agent, object and instruments respectively.

The above objection does not stand, as separate rules are given on each symbol. Though the 'substratum of action' is the meaning of the seventh case it is set aside by the agent, object and instrument symbols which are substratum of action directly. Therefore, those that are locations indirectly or by परम्परासम्बन्ध with the agent and the object will gain the substratum sign like 'सथाल्यां पचति' etc. The vākyapadīya writes - 'that which is the substratum through the agent and the object and not the substratum of action directly, but a kārikā or case helpful in the completion of action is called 'location' in the Śāstra.

The commentaries say that according to the ancient grammarians the seventh case concords with action by परम्परासम्बन्ध or indirect relation. It means स्ववृत्ति वृत्तित्व सम्बन्धेन - 'by the relation of itself being in relation with the other'. Hence, there is only second case in sentences like मोक्षं इच्छति, गृहं प्रविशति etc. and seventh case in मोक्षे इच्छा, गृहे तिष्ठति etc., where through the agent which is the meaning of the verbal root, मोक्ष concords with the action of desire. Therefore, by having the sense of 'the state of being the substratum itself', the doubt that the second case, the third case and the seventh may become synonymous terms is ruled out.

Substratum is of three kinds - औपश्लेषिकम् - 'related to close proximity,' वैषयिकम् - 'related to an object,' अभिव्यापकम् 'pervading'. The commentary explains the expressions as follows - उप समीपे श्लेषः सम्बन्धः close proximity shows the sense of संयुक्तसंयोग 'contact by intimate relation'. Therefore आधार is of two kinds. One is एकदेशावच्छेदेन स्वसम्बन्धि इति - 'its relation, limited by a part.' It is also called आरोपितसम्बन्ध 'imposed relation or contact'. In the sentence कटे शेते though there is contact of the body with a part of the cot, the contact is imposed on the whole cot. Hence कट gains seventh case.

The second is उपश्लेषः समीपे सम्बन्धः, as in गुरौ वसति or गुर्ववधिक समीपदेश वृत्ति शिष्य कर्तृको वासः - the living of the student, who is the agent, in the close place, guru being the limit'. That is, the student is in contact with a place which is also in contact with the teacher. Hence गुरौ is in seventh case.

विषयादागतं वैषयिकम् - 'that which has come due to an object' as मोक्षे इच्छा - 'desire in salvation'. Here the object of desire is मोक्ष.

अभिव्यापक अधिकरण is unique, as the superstratum pervades every part of the substratum, for example तिलेषुतैलम् - 'oil in sesame', दध्नि सर्पिः - 'butter in curds' etc. The two rules सहितायाम् (6.1.72) and तत्र च दीयते (5.1.96) discuss about substratum in details.

K.Bh. now explains the meaning of पञ्चमी or the fifth case. Limit is the meaning of अपादान. The rule is अपादाने पञ्चमी - when an अपादान is to be denoted, the fifth case is added'. The other rule is ध्रुवमपायेऽपादानम् - 'apādāna is that which is a fixed point when separation takes place'. Here अपाय is विभाग or the action that creates separation. अवधि is ध्रुव or fixed point. The state of being the fixed point is - प्रकृतधात्वर्थ विभागजनक क्रियाश्रयत्वेसति प्रकृत धात्वर्थजन्य विभागाश्रयत्वम् - 'not being the substratum of action creating separation, which is the meaning of the root concerned, but being the substratum of separation which is the meaning of the root concerned.' The qualificand is to avoid over application in करण

and other कारकs as in ग्रामादागच्छति शकटेन - 'comes from the village by a cart' and वृक्षात् पर्णं पतति - 'a leaf falls from the tree' etc. and पर्ण not being the substratum of separation, ablation does not set in. The qualifier प्रकृतधात्वर्थः is to avoid ablation for वृक्ष in the sentence वृक्षस्य पर्णं पतति - 'a leaf of the tree falls'. As the meaning of the root पत् is not 'separation' but 'action helping contact below'.

K.Bh. further explains the meanings of पञ्चमी based on the kārikās of the vākyapadīya. The word ध्रुव is formed by adding the suffix अक् after the root ध्रुव् in the sense of 'to be stationary'. Bhartṛhari says -

'In separation that which is not the substratum of action, it is called अपादान. Thus he gives the sense of both चल - 'in motion' and अचल - 'not in motion' for the root ध्रुव. Therefore in the context of अवधि the sense of ध्रुव is not always stationary.

उदासीन means 'that which is not the substratum of the action which is the meaning of the root'. It may be either चल 'in motion' like horses etc or - 'not in motion' like ग्राम etc.

The word अतदावेशात् means तस्याः क्रियायाः आवेशः तदावेशः तत्क्रियाश्रयत्वम् तदभावात् 'not being the substratum of the action which is the meaning of the धातु. In the sentence धावतोऽश्वात्पतति - 'falls from the running horse', though अश्व is the substratum of action i.e. running, yet it is not the substratum of the act of separation. Similarly, in the sentence कुड्यात्पततः अश्वात्पतति - 'falls from the horse which is falling from the wall.' अश्व becomes the fixed point with respect to the separation of चैत्र and therefore अपादान sets in.

In परस्परात्मेषौ अपसरतः the verbal cognition is विश्लेषाश्रयत्वे सति विश्लेषजनक तत्क्रियानाश्रयत्वम् तत्क्रियायां अपादानत्वम् - 'being the substratum of separation and not being the substratum of the act creating separation' is the basis for the ablation sign to set in.

The NKs say - In the sentence वृक्षात् पर्णं पतति if separation takes place due to the shaking of the tree, then the tree will be substratum of the act of separation. But due to the non-pervasion of the above definition वृक्ष cannot have the ablation sign.

This objection cannot stand as the act of shaking etc in the tree is responsible though, for separation, yet it is not the meaning of the root पत्- पत्धात्वर्थे अधः संयोगानुकूल क्रियामात्रम्, न तु पत् -धात्वर्थे विभागस्य प्रवेशः - 'the meaning of the root पत् is - 'action helping contact below,' the sense of separation is absent in the sense of धातु. Therefore धातुवाच्यक्रियानाश्रयत्वम् 'not being the location of the action which is the meaning of the root' is included in the definition. The Bhāṣya reads - अपायस्याविवक्षितत्वात् 'separation not being taken into account', the sentence 'वृक्षस्य पर्णं पतति' 'alone is correct as पर्णं is intended to be a qualifier to वृक्ष and shows relation only.

But when there is विवक्षा for separation it gets अपादान संज्ञा as वृक्षात् पर्णं पतति. Here there is no विवक्षा for सम्बन्ध. The commentary says - तस्य प्रतीतिस्तु पञ्चम्याविभागे आश्रये च शक्तिकल्पनया उपपाद्या - 'such a sense has to be shown by imagining power in 'the substratum of separation' being the meaning of पञ्चमी.

In कुड्यत्पततोऽश्वात्पतति, the state of being a fixed point, of the horse in motion is taken into account for gaining अपादानसंज्ञा.

Now K.Bh. assumes the following doubt - actions are different due to different agents. Yet they are not visible separately in reality. Hence under the rule सरूपणाम् (1.2.64) Patanjali says - न वैतिङन्तानि एकशेषारम्भं प्रयोजयन्ति. Though action is repeated many times there is no need to state एकशेष in them. Because there is nothing like the state of being many actions as action is one only. As a result, there is no scope for many verbs. Hence in परस्परात् the अपादानसंज्ञा may not appear due to क्रियाभेद - 'difference in action'.

According to K.Bh. the doubt should be cleared on the basis of क्रियाभेद due to शब्दभेद - 'different words'. Though the meanings of परस्पर and मेष are the same, based on separate words, separate meanings have to be created and then the sate of being either ablation or agent fixed. There is क्रियानाश्रयत्व - 'the state of not being the substratum of action' in the मेष expressed by परस्पर. Hence, the state of being अपादान is obtained. There is क्रियाश्रयत्व' the state of being the substratum of action' in the मेष expressed by मेष. Hence the state of being the agent is obtained. Thus the required signs are gained.

But there is the fault of non-pervation in the definition. In the sentence वृक्षस्य वस्त्रम् पतति - 'the cloth of the tree falls', the cloth falls due to the movement of the tree. Hence अपादान should set in.

This objection does not stand as there is the absence of the meaning of the root पत् namely 'contact with the place below' in the action of the tree i.e. 'shaking', hence there is no question of non-pervasion.

According to commentators if अपादान is defined as the limiter of the state of being the expressed meaning of पञ्चमी, it leads to prolixity.

According to K.Bh. the statement अवधिः पञ्चम्यर्थः is the definition of अवधि only. It is not the meaning of पञ्चमी. The qualifier 'not being the substratum of action causing separation' is given to avoid over application in पर्ण and शकट etc. But its usefulness is obvious as in the case of the definition dvitiya. Though अवधित्व or the state of being the fixed point means the substratum of separation, in sentences like वृक्षात् पर्णं पतति and ग्रामादागच्छति शकटेन the ablation signs for both पर्ण and शकट are set aside by the agent and instrument signs respectively. The Bhāṣya says अपादानमुत्तराणि कारकाणि बाधन्ते (M.Bh.) The later kārākas set aside the ablation sign.

Hence the meaning of पंञ्चमी according to Kaunḍa Bhaṭṭa is the 'substratum of separation' only.

Bhūṣaṇa reads विभागाश्रयत्वमात्रमर्थः न तु अस्मद्रीत्या विश्लेषजनक क्रिया विश्लेषणाश्रयत्वमर्थः 'substratum of separation only and not the qualifier namely- 'not being the substratum of action which creates separation.

R.K. writes - as all the three words namely - अपादान, अवधि and विभागाश्रय are felt as synonyms in verbal cognition, K.Bh. states अवधिः पञ्चम्यर्थः in the beginning, but shows later on that it is logical to accept विभागाश्रय only as the sense of ablation.

Ancient grammarians do not accept the sense of परसमवेतत्व or the state of being in intimate relation with the other given by the NKs. K.Bh. writes व्यर्थत्वात् 'being useless', while refuting the nyāya school, as two signs cannot set in on the same word at the same time. Thus all schools of philosophy accept definition given by the vaiyākaraṇas except Nāgeśa and Khandadeva.

Nāgeśa accepts परसमवेतत्व by including तत्तत्कर्तृसमवेतत्वम् or the state of being in intimate relation with the respective agents. Otherwise shows the defect of non-pervasion in पर्वतात्पततः etc. Further substantiates his view from the Bhāṣya - न तिङन्तानि एकशेषारम्भं प्रयोजयन्ति, एका हि क्रिया (M.Bh. 1.2.6a). It means though an action in repeated many times there is no need to state एकशेष (one remaining) in them. Because there is nothing like the state of being many actions, as action is one only.

The NKs raise in objection saying - As only 'substratum of separation' is the meaning of ablation, in the sentence वृक्षात् स्पन्दते the meaning of स्पन्द् being प्रस्रवणस्यांधोदेशसंयोगानुकूलद्रवद्रव्यक्रियारूपः - i.e. action helping contact below, and as 'separation' is not the meaning of स्पन्द् it cannot be wrongly derived.

The objection does not stand as in the sentence राज्यात् चलितः etc. though चल् has the sense of गति movement, as it helps the action leading to separation, ablation sets in for the fixed points आसन and राज्य. The same sense being present even in स्पन्द् the usage is accepted. Here द्रव and द्रव्य become the agents.

To avoid this usage K gives another cause-effect notion accepted by some. But it cannot be accepted as there is difficulty in deriving well known usages like अस्मात् चलितः and the like.

If the above definition is accepted, the sentence would be वृक्षात् त्यजति instead of वृक्षं त्यजति.

The objection does not stand as the ablation sign is set aside by the object sign, as explained before. Yet in वृक्षात् त्यजति if the verbal cognition of the state of being अवधि is gained from ablation, it cannot be avoided. In case of roots other than त्यज् the fault can be overcome by the knowledge resulting from other roots.

In the sentence बलाहकात् विद्योतते विद्युत् - 'lightning manifests through the clouds' the ल्यबन्त, निसृत्य - 'coming through' is understood.

In the sentence रूपं रसात् पृथक् - 'form is separate from taste', the sense of separation preceded by contact is imagined by the mind. Even otherwise K says that ablation sets in by the rule पृथग्विना (2.3.32)

Ablation is of three kinds as निर्दिष्ट विषय - 'with subject specified', उपात्तविषय - 'with subject acquired' and अपेक्षितक्रिया - 'with action desired'.

The commentary explains गति as विभागजनक क्रिया - 'action creating separation'. By the act of falling of chaitra, the horse is shown as अवधि .The verb विद्योतते - 'shines' conveys two meanings viz 'comes out' and 'shines'. उपात्त is that where the root conveys its own sense along with some other sense like निस्सरण.

Dar writes - अनुपात्त धात्वर्थक्रिया साकांक्षम् अपेक्षितक्रियामिति - there is the expectancy of the sense of another root not indicated. Both in कुतोभवान् and पाटलिपुत्रात् there is no क्रिया. The act of coming is to be understood. Dar. sums up the three kinds of ablation as follows.

(1) Where both separation and action creating separation are expressed by the root.

(2) Where separation is shown by a verb drawn.

(3) Where both separation and action are shown by the verb understood.

Now K.Bh. elucidates the meaning of चतुर्थी or fourth case. Goal is the meaning of Dative case. It is said that, "Dative is added to a nominal stem in the sense of recipient.' The rules are सप्म्रदाने चतुर्थी and कर्मणा यमभिप्रैति स सम्प्रदानम् (1.4.32). According to grammarians उद्देश्यत्वं चतुर्थ्यर्थः - 'the state of being the goal is the meaning of dative, which is added in the sense of sampradāna.

By the use of the second case affix in कर्मणा यम् the state of being the desire is obtained for dative with respect to कर्मकारक Further the M.Bh. writes that in the sentence विप्राय गां ददाति - 'gives cow to the Brahmin' - उद्देश्यत्वं विप्रे गोजन्यस्वत्व भागितयेच्छा विषयत्वमेव - 'the goal being the desire of ownership due to the cow in the Brahmin'. Thus the word सम्प्रदान is not an etymologically derived word.

The NKs say - विशेष्यत्वं चतुर्थ्यर्थः - 'the state of being qualified is the meaning of चतुर्थी'. In the sentence विप्राय गां ददाति, the desire to offer the cow in charity to the brāhmin, being present in the agent, the brāhmin becomes the subject of that desire, cow etc. become adjectives to that desire. When charity is defined as "disowning by the self and owning by the recipient. Then the sense of the root दा would be स्वस्वत्व ध्वंसावच्छिन्नत्यगो ददात्यर्थः - 'the sense of dā is the charity limited by the destruction of ownership by the destruction of ownership by the self'.

According to the NKs too, the word सम्प्रदान is not a derived word. Some later NKs consider it is derived. But is already shown as opposed to Bhāṣya.

The later MKs define as - दृष्टद्वारक धात्वर्थोद्देश्यत्वम् सम्प्रदानत्वम् - 'the property of being samparadāna is the state of desire being the meaning of धातु through realisation'. Hence in the above sentence the offering of danda to Maitrāvaruṇa is declared to be अर्थकर्म - 'fruitful,' as it is obvious by the use of dative - i.e. धात्वर्थजन्य दृष्टफलशालित्वम् 'created by the sense of dhātu the state of having borne fruit being seen'.

Nāgeśa defines as सम्प्रदानचतुर्थ्यर्थः उद्देश्यः - 'goal is the meaning of dative used in the sense of recipient'. But shows the verbal cognition as ब्राह्मणोद्देश्यकं गोकर्मकम् दानम् - 'charity where the cow is the object and brāhmin is the goal.' He clearly says दानमेव स्वत्वजनकम् - 'in reality charity alone leads to ownership by the recipient'.

The commentary refers to the objection of the vrttikāra regarding the meaning of the word सम्प्रदान.

According to the other grammarians the word सम्प्रदान is not a derived word. The sentence खण्डिकोपाध्यायः शिश्याय चपेटम् ददाति - from the Mahābhāṣya shows the suffering of the student as wished by the teacher. There is agreement with action through pain. Hence शिष्य becomes सम्प्रदान.

But the वृत्तिकार takes it as derived i.e. सम्यक्प्रदीयते यस्मै तत्सम्प्रदानम् - 'to whom charity is given properly is सम्प्रदान'. This leads to स्वस्वत्वनिवृत्ति and परस्वत्वोत्पत्ति. When both these meanings are present then only the सम्प्रदान संज्ञा sets in. Hence the sentence रजकस्य

वस्त्रं ददाति is correct and not रजकाय वस्त्रं ददाति as found in the M.Bh.

Saraḷā further explains the meaning of the Bhāṣya as follows रजकाय वस्त्रं ददाति इत्यत्राधिनीकरणार्थं ददातेर्योगेऽपि चतुर्थी - i.e. even when there is semantic connection with ददाति , having the sense of ownership in the recipient, though temporarily, gives scope for सम्प्रदानसंज्ञा. In रजकस्य, only general relationship is the intention. Hence the sentence न शूद्राय मतिं दद्यात् in the sense 'knowledge should not be imparted to a śūdra' is approved.

According to K.Bh. there are three kinds of recipients. They are अनिराकर्तृ - 'one who does not refuse', प्रेरयितृ - 'one who prompts' and अनुमन्त्रृ - 'one who permits'. In both अनुमन्त्रृ and प्रेरयितृ kind, 'fulfillment of one's desire' is the fruit.

'(He) offers arghya to the Sun' is the example of the first kind. Here the sun does not pray, nor permit nor refuse. In the sentence 'gives cow to the brāhmin', the recipient is the prommptor. In the sentence 'he gives a cow to the teacher', the recipients is the permitter.

Having decided about the meaning of case affixes K now refutes the NKs and MKs who accept secondary meanings also to the case-affixes.

According to K, considering the non-differential relation between प्रकृति and प्रत्यय, the cause namely the knowledge due to कारकविभक्ति becomes विशेष्य - 'the qualified' and प्रकृति becomes विशेषण 'the qualifier'. When this is the cause-effect notion, the case-affixes will be expressions for कर्म, करण etc. Dar. writes- there is no proof for such meanings as specific mention is not made by मुनित्रय in this regard. In support of this view K gives four reasons.

(1) Firstly, there is the violation of the rule कर्मणि द्वितीया

(2) Secondly, in sentences like कृतः कटः and शत्यः अश्वः, the कृत् and तद्धित affixes are clearly seen as expressions of कर्मत्व, करणत्व etc. then it is opposed to the rule - नामार्थयोः अभेदान्वयः - 'there is non-differentiated agreement between name and sense' and therefore there will not be any agreement for कर्मत्व etc. with कट etc due to भेदसम्बन्ध - 'differentiated relation'. As there is non-differentiated agreement in usage, the case-affixes are expressions of the qualified only.

(3) Thirdly in a बहुव्रीहि compound having the sense of the second case affix etc as in the sentence प्राप्तोदकः ग्रामः, the cognition उदककर्तृक प्राप्तिकर्माभिन्नः - 'the village identical with the object of reaching which has water as the agent' is approved by all. Then power for the second case is in the sense of कर्म. Otherwise, the compound in the sense of second case conveys the state of being karman etc and there will be no agreement with ग्राम etc.

(4) Lastly, the words of Patanjali namely सुपां कर्मादयः etc. - 'the cases are used in the sense of कर्म etc.' under the rule बहुषुबहुवचनम् are a proof for cases being the expressions of the qualified.

Regarding the meanings of cases K gives two views. Darpaṇa refers to the other view based on Śaktivāda. According to K just as fruit and action are the meanings of a root, substratum is the meaning of the nominal stem only. Hence according to the view

अनन्यलभ्यः शब्दार्थः -'the meaning of a word is that which is not obtained from any other element', the sense of the second case would be 'the state of being substratum only.'

This view is explained further as follows -

(i) Firstly, due to the relation of identity between the qualifier and the qualified, the meaning आश्रयत्व - 'the state of being the substratum' given to the second case etc. will not violate the rule कर्मणिद्वितीया (2.3.2)

(ii) Secondly, the same relation of identity helps to avoid the fault in बहुव्रीहि compounds like प्राप्तोदक etc.

(iii) Thirdly, as they are standing in apposition to each other and also by the rule युष्मद्युपपदे etc. (1.4.105) though the sense of substratum is seen, yet in subantas there is no proof in giving the sense of substratum to dvitiyā etc.

The NKs object that, the sense of आश्रयत्व given to द्वितीया etc leads to the fault of prolixity due to शक्यतावच्छेदक or the limiter of power being in the state of being the substratum and so on.

The objection is cleared by arguing that the state of being the substratum itself by the relation of identity stands in apposition to शक्यता, शक्यतात्व and so on as the state of being the substarum is of indivisible form and not of infinite form.' Hence there is no fault.

K writes, that alone is the delimitor by identity, by instrumental third case, action alone is conveyed; by ablation separation alone is conveyed, by dative the property of being the goal alone is conveyed. This view does not contradict the view of the MKs in the आकृत्यधिकरण (Jai.Su. 1.3.30). Here, it has been established after a long discussion that आकृति -genus' rather than व्यक्ति - 'individual' is the meaning of a word. Having this in mind, Dixita says शक्तिरेव वा - 'power itself'. Thus for all the six cases power itself is the meaning. The particle ' वा' shows Kaunḍa Bhaṭṭa's approval for both views.

Now K states the meaning of षष्ठी. The rule is षष्ठी शेषे (p) 'relation alone is the meaning of the genitive. However the meaning of कारकषष्ठी is to be understood as power only, since the view that 'power is kārakam' is seen in the Bhāṣya under the fuel सप्तमीपञ्चम्यौ .... (2.3.10)

The genitive case has the sense of general relation. The अनुवृत्ति of the rule अनभिहिते (2.3.1) तत्तच्छक्त्यनभिधाने - extends here. Genitive has general relation as in मातुः स्मरति and also special relation as in राज्ञः पुरुषः But all relations will be through कारक and action. The same idea is expressed in the Bhāṣya - न हि कर्मादिभ्यो अन्ये अर्थाः सन्ति, इह तावत् राज्ञः पुरुषः इति, राजा कर्ता, पुरुषः संप्रदानम् राजा पुरुषाय संपद्रददाति वृक्षस्य शाखा इति वृक्षः शाखायाः अधिकरणम् एवं तर्हि कर्मादीनाम् अविवक्षा शेषः।

In all the above examples there is a कारक 'सम्बन्धश्च सर्वत्र क्रिया कारकभावमूलक एव' . But when it is not specified by कर्म etc. षष्ठी sets in.

The NKs argue that - from the Bhāṣya let power be present in कर्म etc. But what is the objection for saying that द्वितीया conveys the state of being the subject through लक्षणा ? In घटं जानाति - 'knows a pot 'the state of being the subject is revealed by the second case and the state of being the substratum by तिङ्. In रथेन गच्छति action is conveyed by the third case in रथेन by secondary means.

The objection is countered as follows - The affix सुप् etc. have the sense of कर्तृ, कर्म etc. and also the sense of number. By the use of अपि the sense of objectness etc. given on the basis of शक्तिः कारकम् may be understood. In these सुप् and तिङ् suffixes, द्वितीया only sets in, in the sense of कर्म. तृतीया alone is added in the sense of करण, when कर्तृ etc. are specified, the first case alone sets in, and when the state of being one is indicated only singular number sets in - this is called अर्थनियम - 'restriction with reference to meaning'

Similarly by the श्लोकवार्तिक (1.4.25) even शब्दनियम - 'restriction with respect to expression' is well established. It is of two kinds. One having general meaning and the other having special meaning.

शब्दनियम is restriction with reference to expression i.e. the case affix in the present context. For ex. कर्मण्येव द्वितीया implies that the expressions अम्, औट् and शस् alone convey the meaning कर्मन्. अर्थनियम on the contrary implies restriction with reference to the meaning of the case affix. For ex. कर्मणिद्वितीयैव suggests that the second case affix conveys the meaning of कर्म alone.

According to the view यत एवकारस्ततोऽन्यत्र नियमः - 'wherever एवकार is used it restricts the rule elsewhere. For eg. the rule स्वौजसौ... enjoins all cases to प्रातिपदिक in general. But कर्मणिद्वितीया

fixes the rule for adding second case only in the sense of कर्म But the cases enjoined by स्वौजसौ.... are not excluded by this rule and that is how अव्ययs have chance to get all case affixes. The rule अव्ययादाप्सुपः suggests that the सुप् - affixes are added even to अव्ययs, since the elision of the suffixes आप् and सुप् is stated.

Thus K.Bh. concludes by stating that, when rules are readily available to prove otherwise, there is no proof in giving secondary meanings to case affixes. This is opposed to the views of the founders of Nyāya school as well as the grammarians.

End of the chapter on Subartha.

अथ नामार्थनिर्णयः

The meaning of the nominal base

Having stated the meaning of सुप् प्रत्ययs in the last chapter, now K deals with नाम or प्रातिपदिक which is the प्रकृति or base for the सुप् affixes. The first kārikā states that -

Some say that only genus, some others say both genus and individual, and another say that the three viz. genus, individual and gender and one more says all the four viz genus, individuals, gender and number and a few others says all the five namely, genus, individual, gender, number and kārikā are the meanings of the nominal base. The Śāstras have presented all these words.

Whether the expressive power of word lies in genus or individual or both is a controversy present since ancient times.

The सरूप.... (1.2.64) Sūtrahāṣya - आकृत्यभिधानाद्वा एकं विभक्तौ वाजप्यायनः, shows that āchārya Vājapyāyana thought that word express genus. Vyādi who has composed a महाग्रन्थ comprising of one lakh verses, writes - द्रव्याभिधानं व्याडिः - 'words express substance'.

Pāṇini has accepted both. From the view point of जाति पक्ष he has given the rule - जात्यारव्यायां एकस्मिन् बहुवचनं अन्यतरस्याम् (1-2-58) and from व्यक्ति पक्ष, the rule - सरूपाणां etc. Kātyāyana the author of Vārtika upholds जातिपक्ष by the vārtika - आकृतिग्रहणात् सिद्धम् and व्यक्तिपक्ष by the vārtika रूपसामान्यद्वासिद्धम्. Even Patañjali writes under the rule जात्यारव्यायाम् - एवं हि कश्चित् महति गोमण्डले गोपालकं आसीनं पृच्छति, अस्ति अत्र काश्चित् गां पश्यसि इति नूनं अस्य द्रव्यं विवक्षितं इति, तद्यदा द्रव्याभिधानं

तदा बहुवचनं भविष्यति, यदा सामन्याभिधानं तदा एकवचं भविष्यति (1-2-58) and states, the words गो etc. convey genus as well as individuals.

एकं जातिः - means it is brief to say that genus alone is the meaning of the nominal base. As individuals are many, infinite powers have to be created in words.

Objection - Even in individuals, the property of being one is present. As both genus and एकत्व are present, let individual be the meaning of the nominal base.

Reply - Even if power is accepted in the individual, लक्षणा has to be resorted to, for gaining the knowledge of an other individual. Even in जाति शक्तिवाद the relation जात्याश्रयत्व व्यक्तिरूप शक्य is present. In the theory of 'व्यक्ति शक्ति' स्वसमेताश्रय means there is the शक्यसम्बन्ध that the individual, the substratum of genus, exists by intimate relation in the individual. Thus, there is लाघव in the जाति पक्ष and गौरव in the individual.

But power is present in all individuals indicted by जाति. Hence there is no scope for लक्षणा. There is no आनन्त्यदोष - if जात्याश्रय is accepted.

It means power exists in जातिविशिष्ट व्यक्ति. The knowledge of the adjective is the cause for the total knowledge. So, it is proper to state power is genus. This is supported by the maxim 'नागृहीत विशेषणाबुद्धिः' - "Without the knowledge of the qualification, there is no knowledge of the qualified. That means, word conveys 'genus' by अभिधावृत्ति, and the individual by लक्षणा. Because 'विशेष्यं नाभिधागच्छेत् क्षीणशक्तिर्विशेषणे'. Genus is conveyed by अभिधा and लक्षणा is needed for the knowledge of the individual. Then only the meaning of the case concords with the लक्ष्यार्थ, the individual. This supports, 'प्रत्ययानां प्रकृत्यर्थान्वित स्वार्थ बोधकत्वं'

Objection - But two vrttis cannot function simultaneously (युगपत् वृत्तिद्वय विरोधः)

Reply - In 'गङ्गायां मीनघोषौ स्तः, the concordance of the fish in Gangā and of village in the bank, simultaneously, is well known. Both शक्ति and लक्षणा, not required for तात्पर्य should not be stated simultaneously.

Objection - In 'गौः अस्ति', just as the individual concords with action, even the genus गोत्व concords with action. Hence there is no लक्षणा due to the absence of 'अन्वयानुपपत्ति'. In that case there is no knowledge of the individual.

Reply - The cause for लक्षणा is तात्पर्यानुपपत्ति and not अन्वयानुपपत्ति.

In जातिशक्तिवाद, genus refers to the special property present in the object. It is not the well known genus present by intimate relation in eternal objects. Therefore there is no fault of अव्याप्ति in आकाशत्व and अभावत्व.

Genus is conveyed by the cause effect notion that शक्यार्थोपस्थिति is the cause for the knowledge of शक्यतावच्छेदक. The individual is the meaning of एकं and not genus. Even the व्यक्तिपक्ष is well known, as otherwise, the word अण् in the rule अणुदित् (1.1.6a) would have been useless. Even according to जातिशक्तिवाद , जाति is responsible for the total knowledge and by लक्षणा the individual is conveyed, in that case the use of अण् is in vain, as Pāṇini has included अण् in अणुदित् and ordains एकशेष by सरूपाणां. Hence the व्यक्ति पक्ष is also accepted. Among the causes for deciding power, usage is also important. व्यवहार is called 'शक्तिग्राहक शिरोमणि. Usage shows that power lies in the individual.

The statement that 'genus is उपलक्षक' means, genus separates the individual who is the substratum for it from all other things.

Objection - If power is accepted in 'जाति उपलक्षितव्यक्ति', then genus becomes शक्य and उपलक्षण for the शक्यार्थ namely the individual, then by the maxim नागृहीत....' etc. घटत्व the शक्यतावच्छेदक becomes the expressed meaning of a word.

Reply - दण्ड is the cause for the production of the pot and not दण्डत्व. As per the maxim 'अन्यथा सिद्ध शून्यस्य नियता पूर्ववर्तिता,' in गङ्गायां घोषः, तीरत्व is not लक्ष्यार्थ, तीर alone is लक्ष्यार्थ. The शक्यतावच्छेदक or the उपलक्षणजाति need not be accepted as the expressed meaning of a word. Without becoming शक्यार्थ genus can be उपलक्षक for the individual.

K.Bh. supports his view by kārikā from the tantravārtikā of Kumārila Bhaṭṭa. The idea is though the individuals pot etc are many, the property (genus) pervading them identifies all individuals. Hence, there is no need for many powers. Moreover, genus is not the उपलक्षण for other individuals. अश्व is not conveyed by the word गो. Actually, one has to accept the presence of both जाति and व्यक्ति in each theory. According to the सरूपसूत्रभाष्य - 'न हि आकृति पदार्थकस्य द्रव्यं न पदार्थः, द्रव्यं पदार्थकस्य वा आकृतिः न पदार्थः उभयोरुभयं पदार्थं कस्यचित् किञ्चित् प्रधानभूतं किञ्चित् गुणभूतं,' in the theory of 'power in genus' genus is विशेष्य and the individual is the adjective, in the theory of 'power in the individual', the individual is prādhāna and jāti is gauṇa (adjective). Jāti and Vyakti are co-existent. Therefore power has to be accepted in both जातिविशिष्टव्यक्ति and व्यक्तिविशिष्टजाति. That is why in ब्राह्मणो न हन्तव्यः - the knowledge of एकता of the form of the genus Brāhmāṇa, through the knowledge of the individual concords in the act of killing. In गौः न हन्तव्या, when the individual becomes prominent, on the basis that 'आकृति or जाति is one' singular number is used. Bhartrhari has summed up all these views very aptly in kārikā of his vākyapadīya.

भिन्नदर्शनं आश्रित्य व्यवहारोऽनुगम्यते ।
तत्र यन्मुख्यं एकेषां तत्र अन्येषां विपर्ययः ॥

The view that 'एकं नामार्थः' is that genus has to be included in the cause, not the individual. In the कारणता present in शब्दज्ञान, जाति alone is the अवच्छेदक, through the relation of विषयता and not in the individual - 'घटत्वविषयक शक्तिज्ञान' is the cause for घटत्व विषिष्ट घट विषयक बोध . In this cause effect notion घटत्वशक्तिज्ञान being brief, is the cause. If घटत्व विशिष्ट शक्ति ज्ञान is accepted as the cause, it leads to गौरव. When the knowledge of घटत्वशक्ति is the cause, as घटत्व alone is the विशेषण of the knowledge, even the कारणतावच्छेदक will be created in घटत्व only. The genus घटत्व, the adjective in the knowledge of power is the कारणतावच्छेदक. The relation by which the cause exists in the effect, is called कारणतावच्छेदक.

According to grammarians शक्ति is बोधजनकत्व. The knowledge of power of the form 'घटत्वविषयकबोधजनकत्व' is the cause of घटविषयकशाब्दबोध. As the genus घटत्व is one both as प्रकार of शक्तिज्ञान and as अवच्छेदक घटत्व, the word एकं is used in the kārikā.

Objection - घटो घट पद शक्यः - pot is the meaning of the word 'pot'. This knowledge cannot be an adjective (अन्यप्रकारक) to any other knowledge, but gives the knowledge घटत्वप्रकारकघटविषयकबोध. Similarly, जातित्वेन जातिप्रकारक or घटत्वत्वेन घटत्वत्प्रकारक शाब्दबोध also comes, thus शक्तिज्ञान is useful for both kinds of verbal knowledge.

Reply - If स्वरूपतः घटत्वप्रकारक शाब्दबोध has to come, then the knowledge of शक्ति, without any second adjective in घटत्व, is the cause. This alone has been clearly stated as 'अन्यप्रकारक'. If the knowledge of घटत्व has to come from घटत्वत्व and of जाति from जातित्व, the cause is the knowledge जातित्व प्रकारकशक्ति or घटत्वत्व in घटत्व. Therefore the above problem does not rise.

By the earlier arguments and the authority of the Bhāṣya विशेष्य is शक्य, द्विकं is जाति, and व्यक्ति separately is नामार्थ. This theory is further explained - Even Nāgeśa in his लघुशब्देन्दुशेखर Writes - प्रवृत्तिनिमित्तं जातिः, तदाश्रयत्वं व्यक्तिः प्रातिपदिकार्थः । 'एकं नामार्थ' - is explained as - It is brief to say that for all kinds of power such as द्विकः, त्रिकः etc जातिशक्तिज्ञान is the cause. The कारणतावच्छेदक in the शाब्दबोध being of one kind all doubts have been resolved.

The contradiction can be resolved if we accept power by in विषयिता in जातिपक्ष and व्यक्तिपक्ष; by विशेष्यता in जातिविशिष्टव्यक्तिपक्ष; by विषयिता in the पक्ष 'त्रिकं' - thus considering प्रकारिता and विशेष्यता as विषयितात्व, and by approving 'विषयितावच्छेदकं शक्ति :' As शक्य is present in अवच्छेदकत्व like अवच्छेदकतात्व there is no contradiction.

After discussing, whether a nominal base expresses genus or individual or both, now explains that gender is also the meaning of a nominal base.

त्रिकं प्रातिपदिकार्थः - The suffixes टाप् etc are manifestors. The nominal base is expressive. Hence, in words वाक्, उपानत्, वेधाः, मधु, दधि etc the gender is conveyed by prakṛti or nominal base. Moreover, Pāṇini's sūtras, स्वमोर्नपुंसकात् (7-1-23) and ह्रस्वो नपुंसके प्रातिपादिकस्य (1-2-47) states that gender is also नामार्थ. The word नपुंसक means नपुंसकवाचकप्रातिपदिक.

Under the rule स्त्रियां (4-1-2) in the sūtrabhāṣya the method of identifying the gender in the world has been stated. But this is not applicable to the science of grammar. The word वृक्ष is not masculine, खट्वा is not feminine. The Bhāṣya states - तस्मात् न वैयाकरण्यः शक्यं लौकिकं लिङ्गं आस्थातुं, अवश्यं कश्चित् स्वकृतान्तः आस्थेयः (4.1.2). Then again he has stated, "संस्त्या न विवक्षायां स्त्री, प्रसविवक्षायां पुमान्, उभयोरविवक्षायां नपुंसकं । The collection of सत्त्व, रजस् and तमस् i.e. when ruling or आधिपत्य is expressed it is masculine; when अपचय or some shortage is intended it is feminine gender, when it is normal it is nuetar.

This gender based on meaning is kevalānvayi and all genders are in all meanings. Hence in one object, all the three genders are seen as 'अयं पदार्थः' 'इयं व्यक्तिः', and 'इदं वस्तु'. The gender shown in the meaning is imposed on शब्द and then the usage comes as पुल्लिङ्ग etc. Due to difference in जाति, गुण, क्रिया, etc the word तट etc are different from other words. The proof for this is the usage 'पुल्लिङ्ग शब्दः' and the rules तस्मान् शसो नः पुंसि (6-1-103), अजोनास्त्रियां (2-3-120) स्वमोर्नपुंसकात् (7-1-23). Due to the contradicting properties of पुंस्त्व etc present in words, though समान आनुपूर्वि exists, due to conditions उपयच etc. words like तट have become different.

Objection - As this change is conditional it is not right to fix genders.

Reply - Though contradiction is seen, due to समान आनुपूर्वि अभेद is imposed on words. Therefore, the usage that one word has many genders is accepted.

Like the पदार्थशब्द, if the word पशु, indulges in स्त्री व्यक्ति, even छागी has to become अङ्ग for sacrifice. The gender present in words conveys the meaning पशु etc. as there is तादात्म्य in शब्दार्थ. In पशुना यजेत, due to 'नादेश' after पशु it is not in feminine gender. Hence छागी cannot become अङ्ग.

The word व्यक्ति is क्तिन् प्रत्ययान्त. Hence नित्य स्त्रीलिङ्ग. In the case of the word पशु, there is no proof to say that it is नित्यपुल्लिङ्ग. Even the MKs have stated in the rule 'तथा च लिङ्गं' that like number even gender is विवक्षाधीन - based on the view of the speaker.

The use of gender in the vedas is discussed in detail in भूषण. चतुष्कं means जाति, व्यक्ति, लिङ्ग and संख्या are the meanings of the nominal base. पञ्चकं - जाति, व्यक्ति, लिङ्ग, संख्या and कारक are the meanings of the nominal base.

Objection - According to अन्वय (यत्सत्वे यत्सत्वं) and व्यतिरेक (यदाभावे यदाभावः) gender is the meaning of the suffix. If the स्त्रीप्रत्यय is seen it is feminine gender. If सुप् etc. are seen, it shows number and Kārakā. Hence gender is not the meaning of the nominal base.

Reply - In दधिपश्य etc. where there is लुक् for the प्रत्यय, gender is conveyed. Moreover, लिङ्गानुशासन is meant for प्रकृति or the nominal base only. As 'प्रकृति' is expressive, the sense of number comes to it by the rule 'स्वौजस....' (4-1-2) and the न्याय-अनिर्दिष्टार्थाः प्रत्ययाः स्वार्थेभवन्ति and the भाष्य states the नियमसूत्रs namely द्वेकयोः (1-2-22) and कर्मणि द्वितीया (2-3-2)

As there is difference of opinion regarding gender, the sastra states 'एषु पक्षेषु न निर्बन्धः' there is no compulsion regarding these views. But Bharthari has summed up briefly all the view -

ज्योतिका वाचिकावास्युः द्वित्वादीनां विभक्तयः ।
यद्वा संख्यावतोर्थस्य समुदायोभिधायकः ॥

The word शास्त्रे in Dixita's kārika makes it clear in many places that all the five are the meanings of the nominal base.

शब्दस्तावत् .... इति च - By these five meanings a word makes its form clear. Even the listener gets the idea of the form before getting the meaning. In support of this K quotes a kārika from Bharthari which says - that without the knowledge of शब्द, no knowledge can be acquired in the world. All knowledge is bound (अनुविद्ध or आच्छादित) by शब्द. There is identity between शब्द and अर्थ. Even in direct perception, meaning is imposed on the word. To indicate this आरोपितशब्दज्ञान, Bhartrhari has used in his kārika - उत्प्रेक्षावाचक इव शब्द. In विष्णुं उच्चारय etc. it is not possible to pronounce the meaning. Only the आनुपूर्वि, विष्णु has to be recited. Therefore, there is no शाब्दबोध without आनुपूर्वि. Hence even शब्द is the meaning of the nominal base.

The knowledge of आनुपूर्वि does not come even by लक्षणा through the relation of स्ववाच्यवाचकत्व. Without the result of the type - अनादितात्पर्यविषयीभूत शक्तिसमकक्ष्यापन्ना निरूढा लक्षण. In cases like

'जबगडदशं उच्चारय' as there is no power in the समुदाय, there is no scope for शक्य सम्बन्ध रूपलक्षणा. But, as there is शाब्दबोध in 'जबगडदश', शब्द should also be accepted as प्रातिपादिकार्थ.

Some say that असाधुशब्दs or wrong words remind us of the right words and शाब्दबोध takes place. Hence the अनुकरण of the असाधुशब्द. 'गावं उच्चारय is declared साधु. The Bhāṣya on the rule ऋॡक् says, अनुकरणs are साधुशब्दs.

न च अपशब्द पदार्थकः शब्दः अपशब्दो भवति, यो हि मन्यते अपशब्द पदार्थकः शब्दः अपशब्दो भवतीति, तस्य अपशब्द इत्येव अपशब्दः स्यात् - By this it is clear that अनुकरण is साधु. Thus, the above six namely जाति, व्यक्ति, लिङ्ग, संख्या, कारक and आनुपूर्वि are the meanings of a nominal base. (नामार्थ).

Hence it is stated that - षोडापि क्वचित् प्रातिपदिकार्थः. क्वचित् means the difference between अनुकार्य and अनुकरण.

शब्दोपि यदि भेदेन - This kārikā makes the above discussion more clear. अनुकरण is of two kinds, to imitate the sound and to imitate the letter. 'पटत् करोति' is the अनुकरण or ध्वनि. 'भुवोवुक्' is the अनुकरण of letters. As there are differences like ध्वनिमयत्व-वर्णमयत्व etc. in अनुकार्य-अनुकरण for the knowledge of अनुकार्य from, power as अनुकार्यनिरूपितशक्ति should be accepted in अनुकरण.

(That which has the vṛtti by the relation of आश्रयता or निरूपकता becomes the subject for शाब्दबोध. As the relation is द्विष्ट like अर्थ, there is the knowledge of शब्द also.

Bhartṛhari writes - Just as light has two powers ग्राह्यत्व-ग्राह्यकत्व

even in words there are two separate powers called बोध्यत्व-बोधकत्व. Without disclosing their forms words will not convey their meanings.

Reply - In the अभेदपक्ष, the subject is the cause in श्रावणप्रात्यक्ष. On the basis of the knowledge got from अनुकरण, there is no problem in the अनुकार्यशब्द of the form of श्रावणप्रत्यक्ष, becoming the subject for शाब्दबोध.

Objection - If पजदन्य उपस्थिति is the cause for शाब्दबोध , in exs. like घटः अस्ति, by intimate relation, as the knowledge of आकाश the substratum of sound, also results from पद, and if पदजन्य उपस्थिति is the cause for शाब्दबोध, then आकाश also becomes the subject for verbal knowledge.

Reply - The knowledge of word coming from power etc. is the cause for शाब्दबोध. The knowledge of आकाश, the substratum of sound by समावाय, though comes from the word घटः, as it is not वृत्तिविशिष्ट present in the word घट, there is no over extension. Whatever has vṛtti by the relation of आश्रयता becomes the subject for शाब्दबोध. Thus there is no fault in this theory. As the relation is द्विष्ट - two sided like अर्थ, there is the knowledge of शब्द also. Bhaṛtrhari has made this clear in his वाक्यपदीय - 'just as light has two powers as ग्राह्यत्व-ग्राहकत्व, even in words there are two separate powers as बोध्यत्व-बोधकत्व. Without disclosing their forms, words will not convey their meanings.

शब्द means, eve आनुपूर्वि is seen in शाब्दबोध. Hence, along with the five stated above, आनुपूर्वि also becomes नामार्थ. Thus there are six meanings for nominal base. The Harikārikā 'नसोऽस्ति' also justifies this.

Objection - As अभेद has been accepted for अनुकार्य-अनुकरण, the power indicated by अनुकार्य is not present in अनुकरण. As the अनुकार्य उपस्थिति takes place by अनुकरण and its similarity through the sense of hearing and as व्यक्तिज्ञानजन्य उपस्थिति is absent, अनुकार्य is not seen in verbal knowledge.

Reply - According to the rule 'लक्ष्यानुसारात् व्यवस्था' in some places even if वृत्तिज्ञानजन्यउपस्थिति is not present, it shows itself in शाब्दबोध. शब्द by the relation of आश्रयता, अर्थ by the relation of निरूपकता, and as it is वृत्तिमत्, becomes the subject for शाब्दबोध. The meaning which is वृत्तिमत् by the relation of निरूपकता, has been accepted in the rule 'अर्थवत्'. The sign of 'प्रातिपदिक' will not set in for अनुकरण in अभेदपक्ष. Though the method shown above leads to गौरव, as it is based on experience, there is no fault. K.Bh. quotes from Bhāṣya again the states, शब्दरूप (the form of word) means आनुपूर्वि and its meaning, both are coming from शब्द alone. According to कार्यान्वय, प्रकारता and विशेष्यता are seen in them.

Bhartrhari has made it clear that even शब्द being वृत्तिमत् has two powers as ग्राह्यत्व-ग्राह्यकत्व or प्रकाश्यत्व-प्रकाशकत्व Just as light shows objects and illuminates itself, even word conveys meaning as well as discloses its form. That is why, the latter half of the second kārikā is stated as न सत्तयैव तेऽर्थानां अगृहीताः प्रकाशकाः, sound, without being heard, just by its existence cannot convey any meaning is the idea of the second kārikā.

प्रसंगात् ...... इत्यर्थ - In this kārika, K justifies the अभेद for अनुकार्य - अनुकरण. अत एव गवित्याह -

In the अभेदपक्ष, the अनुकरण शब्दs namely, गो, भू etc do not get the sign of the nominal base. Then even the case will not come. Without case it cannot become पद. The rule 'अपदं न प्रयुञ्जीत' comes into force.

As शिष्टप्रयोगs like भू-सत्तायां and गवित्ययमाह are seen, though these become अपदs, they are not असाधुशब्दs. अपदं means 'अपरिनिष्ठितं,' It is defined as 'अप्रवृत्त नित्य विध्युद्देश्यतावाच्छेदक अनाक्रान्तत्वं परिनिष्ठितत्वम्. Though the word has the property mentioned in the sutra, if the नित्यविधिसूत्र is not applicable, then that word is 'अपरिनिष्ठित'. If the उद्देश्यतावच्छेदक required for the operation of नित्यविधिसूत्र is not there, it becomes परिनिष्ठित. For ex. राम-स्. Here the अप्रवृत्तनित्यविधि is रुत्व enjoined by the rule ससजुषोरुः. Its उद्देश्यतावच्छेदक is the पदान्तसकार. Thus रामस् is अपरिनिष्ठित. रामः is परिनिष्ठित.

Thus, according to the परिनिष्ठितलक्षण, in the अभेदपक्ष even if there is no meaning to गो, भू etc. and as a result no प्रातिपदिकसंज्ञा, still they are परिनिष्ठित or साधुशब्दs. साधुत्व is a जातिविशेष, to be known by शिष्टप्रयोग. The भेदा-भेद पक्ष in the case of अनुकार्य-अनुकरण is like जातिव्यक्ति पक्ष based on usage (शिष्टप्रयोग). Hence some अनुकरणप्रयोगs are seen with case and without case also.

End of the chapter Nāmārtha.

समासशक्तिनिर्णयः

The meaning of Compounds

After explaining नामार्थ, समास being नामविशेष K.Bh. proceeds to state his doctrine on semantic conditions of compounds. What is a समास ? समसनं समासः । अनेकस्य पदस्य एकपदवीभवनं समासः इत्यर्थः । The purpose of compounding words is to express the idea in minimum possible words. Thus the समासs compress more meaning or express a unitary meaning other than what is conveyed by individual words.

The first kārikā states the six divisions of compounds. This is based on the rule सुहसुपा (2.1.4)

सुपां सुपां तिङा नाम्ना धातुनाऽथ तिङां तिङा ।
सुबन्तेनेति च ज्ञेयः समासः षड्विधो बुधैः ॥

Here सुप् stands for subanta and तिङ् for तिङन्त. Subanta compounds with another subanta, tiñanta prātipadika and dhātu. Similarly तिङन्त compound with another तिङन्त and subanta. Thus there are six kinds of compounds. The examples are as follows - (1) सुपां सुपा-राजपुरुषः, अक्षशौण्डः where both are subantas. (2) सुपां तिङा - ex. पर्यभूषयत्, अनुव्यचलत् - Here the पूर्वपद is subanta and उत्तरपद is तिङन्त. In वि-अचलत् Samāsa has set in by the योगिविभाग सेह.' In 'अनु-व्यचलत्' by the vārtika under the rule कुगति प्रादयः (2-2-15) as the गतिमत् तिङन्त is व्यचलत्, compound has set in. The result of samāsa is accent (3) सुपां नाम्ना-कुम्भकारः - कुम्भं करोति - when the word कुम्भ is a उपपद, the suffix अण् sets in after the root कृ by the rule कर्मणि अण् (3.2.1). Then समास is effected in कुम्भ अस् कार by the rule उउपदमतिङ् (2.2.19). This समास is effected before सुप् comes after the latter word कार, by the metarule - गति कारकोपपदानां कृद्भिस्सह समासवचनं प्राक् सुप् उत्पत्तेः. The पूर्वपद is a सुबन्त. If समास is accepted before the suffix 'sup' sets in between the पूर्वोत्तर पदs, then in examples like चर्म क्रीती, as चर्मन् is not a पद, the elision of न may not take place (4) सुपां धातुना - subantas with verbal roots. Ex. - कटप्रूः and अयतस्तूः . The compounding of the word कट with root प्रु and the word अयत with root स्तु takes place by the vārtika क्विब्वचि प्रच्छ्यायत यतस्तु कट प्रुजु श्रीणां दीर्घश्च under the rule अन्येभ्योपि दृश्यते (3.2.18). In this vārtika the निपातन has been done of समास with the verbal root like कटप्रूः and अयतस्तूः . निपातन means, 'when there is no other विधायकसूत्र to show the कार्य or effect within the frame work of the सूत्र and the वार्तिक, it is called निपातन. 'सिद्ध प्रक्रिया निर्देशः निपातनम्' Exs. कटं प्रवते-कटप्रूः, अयतं स्तौति अयतस्तूः.

Objection - In places of क्विबन्त, the verbal root being nominal base becomes नाम. Then सुबन्त can get compounded with नाम. The group of words like कटप्रू, आयतस्तूः can be brought under this category. Hence, there is no need for another category like सुपां धातूनां.

Reply - In examples like कटप्रू and आयतस्तूः, the word आयत concords with स्तवनरूपक्रिया. It is not an adjective to स्तवनकर्तृ.

The नामपद alone is क्विप् प्रत्ययान्त but not the root स्तु. The word आयत concords with the meaning of the root स्तु and not with क्विबन्त. Therefore the category ''सुपां धातुना' is stated separately. (5) तिङां

तिङा - A verb with another verb. Here both are tiñantas. Ex. पिबतखादत, पचतभृज्जत. - The rule responsible for समास here is the गणसूत्र - 'आख्यातं आख्यातेन क्रिया सातत्ये' under the rule मयूरव्यंसकादयश्च (2.1.72) - पिबत खादत इति एवं सततं यत्र अधीयते सा - पिबतरवादत. (6) तिङ् सुबन्तेन ex. जहिस्तम्भः Here the earlier word is तिङन्त and the later word is सुबन्त. Here the समास operates by the गणसूत्र - 'जहि कर्मणा बहुलमाभीक्षये कर्तारं चाभिदधाति' under the rule. मयूरव्यंसकादयश्च - जहिस्तम्भं जहिस्तम्भं इति यः मुहुः मुहुः आह सः जहिस्तम्भः.

All the above six kinds of समासs are obtained by analysing the rule सहसुपा (2.1.4). More details are available on this topic in शब्द कौस्तुभ.

स्वयं ... भावः - Bhaṭṭoji has explained in his kārikā, the divisions of समास stated clearly in the bhāṣya etc and writes that the definition and classification of compounds by ancient grammarians has the faults of avyāpti, ativyāpti and asambhava. Hence, he calls it as प्रायोवाद or theory of probability in the next kārikā.

समासस्तु चतुर्धा इति - A definition comprises the statement of the special property or असाधारणधर्म (of any object, person etc.) For ex. सास्नावत्वं गोलक्षणम् means the property not found in bison etc. but invariably found in all cow individuals. Such a definition should not have the fault of अव्याप्ति etc. लक्षणे तान्येव पदानि देयानि यैः अव्याप्ति अतिव्याप्ति असम्भवदोषः वार्यन्ते । तत्र एकदेश लक्षणसत्वं अव्याप्तिः. If the special property is absent in a few cases it is called the fault of non-application. अलक्ष्ये लक्षणसत्वं अतिव्याप्तिः - the presence of the special property in a few cases other than object लक्ष्यमात्र अवर्तनं असंभवः - The absence of the special property in any of the objects mentioned in असंभवः. A perfect definition should not have any of these three faults.

According to ancient grammarians, समास has been classified into four kinds as अव्ययीभाव, तत्पुरुष, बहुव्रीहि and द्वन्द्व The word प्रायः is used in the sense of बाहुल्य or many cases. In that case, the compounds without any special symbol like भूतपूर्वः, दृग्भूः, काराभूः, आयतस्तूः, वागर्थाविव, etc. cannot be brought under any of the above four compounds get established by the help of Pāṇinian sūtras and also by the technique of निपातन in the सूत्रs and वार्तिकs.

The sūtras give us indications as पूर्वपदार्थप्रधान, उत्तरार्थप्रधान etc. based on its concordance with action. Regarding the meaning of a compound word the grammarians treat it as अखण्ड indivisible.

For ex. compounds like राजपुरुषः denote a whole, qualified whole. They are really indivisible. In the compound राजपुरुषः, the शक्यतावच्छेद or the limiter of the state of being power present unitedly is राजपुरुषत्व or the state of a being a राजपुरुष. Its parts राजत्व and पुरुषत्व or not शक्यतावच्देदकs or limiters of being power. Therefore the words राजन् and पुरुष have no separate meanings.

Even the definitions पूर्वपदार्थप्रधानः अव्ययीभावः, उत्तरपदार्थ प्रधानः तत्पुरुषः, अन्यपदार्थप्रधानः बहुव्रीहिः, उभयपदार्थप्रधानः द्वन्द्वः are general definitions only (प्रायिक लक्षणs). Not (निष्कृष्ट) perfect definitions. In examples like उन्मत्तगंगं, सूतप्रति, अर्धपिप्पली, द्वित्राः, शशकुशपलाशं etc. there is mutual fault. K explains them as follows - In the ex. उन्मत्ता

गङ्गा यस्मिन् देशे सः उन्मत्तगंगम् - In this avyayībhāva compound, there is no प्राधान्य for पूर्वपद. Hence there is non-extension of the definition of avyayībhāva. As the अन्यपदार्थ is प्रधान there is the fault of over extension of the definition of bahuvrīthi. Here the avyayībhāva compound is effected by the rule अन्यपदार्थैकसंज्ञायाम् (2.1.21)

In the example सूपप्रति there is avyayībhāva. But 'प्रति', the उत्तर पदार्थ being प्रधान, there is the fault of the ativyāpti of the definition of tatpuruṣa, and pūrva padārtha being apradhāna there is the avyāpti of अव्ययीभाव लक्षण.

In the example for tatpuruṣa compound पिप्पल्याः अर्धं अर्धपिप्पली, the compound is effected by the rule अर्धं नपुंसकम् (2.2.2). Here as the पूर्वपदार्थ is important there is over extension of the definition of avyayībhāva, and as the उत्तरपद is not important, there is the non-extension of the definition of tatpuruṣa.

In the bahuvrīhi compound द्वौवा त्रयो वा द्वित्राः the bahavrīhi comes by the rule संख्याव्ययासन्न दूराधिक संख्याः संख्ये ये (2.2.25). Here both words being important there is over extension of the definition of dvandva and anyapadārtha being unimportant there is the non-extension of the definition of bahuvrīhi.

In the dvandva compound शशश्चकुशश्चपलाशश्च एषां समाहारः शशकुशपलाशं, the samāsa is due to the rule चार्थे द्वन्द्वः (2.2.28). Here as there is समाहाररूप अन्यपदार्थ प्राधान्य there is over application of the definition of bahuvrīhi and as there is no equal importance for all words there is the non-application of the definition of dvandva.

According to the doctrine of grammar, if the compounds come into effect under the अधिकार of the rules stated for this purpose, namely अव्ययीभावः (2.1.5), तत्पुरुषं (2.1.22), शेषो बहुव्रीहि (2.2.23), चार्थेद्वन्द्वः (2.2.29), then there is no fault. Moreover, the principle of जहत्स्वार्थ and एकार्थीभाव - the notion of unitary meaning have been accepted by व्याकरण सिद्धान्त. In that case there is no question of पूर्वोत्तरपदs. Hence the definitions stated above are not applicable to any लक्ष्यs or compounds. Hence there is the defect of असम्भव दोष.

Though there is no reference like 'this is पूर्व' and 'this is पर' in Samāsa and other vṛttis, the usage (प्रयोग), which existed earlier like पूर्व and पर is accepted. This is similar to the drawing of a गवय on paper. This is called रेखागवयन्याय. In the drawing thorough there are no real face, legs etc statements such as 'this is the face', 'this the leg' etc are made. Similarly in compounds also, the usage 'this is पूर्व', 'this is उत्तर' is accepted, though it is unreal.

As the parts of the गवय are revealed, only by सादृश्य, similarly, by the सादृश्य of the पूर्वोत्तरपदs in the विग्रहवाक्य, before the vrtti, the पूर्वोत्तरपदाs have to be understood even in compounds.

ननु.... इति बोधः - Under the rule समर्थः पदविधिः (2.1.1) Patāñjali has given several views. Of them जहत्स्वार्थ and अजहत्सवार्थ concepts have been explained as follows - जहत्स्वार्थ leads to एकार्थीभाव and अजहत्सवार्थ leads to व्यपेक्षा theory. जहत्सवार्थः means जहति (पदानि) स्वार्थं यस्यां सा जहत्स्वार्था - न जहत्स्वार्थाः -अजहत्स्वार्था. In the case of एकार्थीभाव as the समुदाय reveals the total meaning, the individual words do not express their meanings. The Bhāṣya states - प्रक्रिया

दशायां प्रत्येकं अर्थवत्वेन पृथक् गृहीतानां पदानां समुदाय शक्त्या विशिष्ट एकार्थ प्रतिपादकत्वम् - एकार्थीभावः (2.2.1). In the second अजहत्स्वार्थ or व्यपेक्षापक्ष, the individual words have meanings. Then by आकांक्षा, they concord mutually. The Bhāṣya states स्वार्थपर्यवसायिनां पदानां आकांक्षावशात् परस्परान्वयः व्यपेक्षा.

In जहत्स्वार्था vrtti like the letters having no meaning in a word, the words too in a samāsa will have no separate meanings. In examples like राजपुरुषः, it is due to समासशक्ति alone, the meaning राजविशिष्टपुरुषः is expressed. Hence, there is no need to give power to convey meanings separately to राज and पुरुष.

There are two more examples वृषभ and यावक. The word वृष, though conveys वृषभ, the word वृष in वृषभ is not given the meaning वृषभ in usage. Similarly, याव and यावक. As the words वृषभ and यावक give the required meanings, it is not proper to say that the words वृष and याव are the वाचकs of वृषभ and यावक. Similarly, in राजपुरुषः, it is useless to give individual meanings to राज and पुरुष as the whole meaning comes from the समुदाय.

If separate meanings are accepted for parts in a compound, then in vigrahavākya राज्ञः पुरुषः, as the word राजन् conveys meaning independently, the adjective ऋद्धस्य, which has the usage ऋद्धस्य राज्ञः पुरुषः can be used as ऋद्धस्य राजपुरुषः as राजन् expresses meaning separately.

This fault will not occur in एकार्थीभाव. According to the theory of जहत्स्वार्थ, the parts have no meaning, hence the word राजन् does not express meaning separately. Then according to the maxim

'पदार्थः पदार्थेन अन्वेति न पदार्थ एकदेशेन, there is no विशेषणान्वय in one word or एकदेश.

अजहत्स्वार्थ or व्यपेक्षासामर्थ्य is explained as - There is no proof for अतिरिक्तशक्ति in समासादि vrttis. As the meaning is conveyed by the individual words, to imagine power in the whole leads to the fault of prolixity. Due to आकांक्षा, योग्यता etc. the meaning expressed by the individual words conveys the whole meaning. Patāñjali called अजहत्स्वार्थ as व्यपेक्षापक्ष. According to this, in a compound, there is the opposition from the vārtika namely सविशेषणानां वृत्तिर्न, वृत्तस्य वा विशेषणयोगो न (2.1.1). Hence, the concordance of ऋद्धस्य with the word राज, the एकदेश (part) will not take place. Hence, as there is meaning for the earlier and later words in a compound, the rules पूर्वपदार्थप्रधानः अव्ययीभावः etc. are acceptable. The भाष्यकार has said - परस्परव्यपेक्षां सामर्थ्यं एके.

Now, each one of these two kinds is of three kinds as भेद, संसर्ग and भेदसंसर्ग. According to Kaiyaṭa - यदि वृत्तौ भेदसंसर्गौ न स्यातां तदा सामर्थ्यमेव न स्यात् , तादात्मकत्वात् सामर्थ्यस्य - If there is no difference in भेद and संसर्ग in the vrtti, there will be no sāmarthya. भेद exists with संसर्ग by अविनाभाविसंबन्ध (relation of identity). Hence भेद is समासवाच्य, संसर्ग being in अविनाभावि relation, संसर्ग becomes समासवाक्य. Here भेद means अन्योन्याभाव or mutual negation like घटो न पटः.

In the example राजपुरुषः, according to the भेदपक्ष the word राजन् separates the पुरुष from other masters. (राजभिन्न असंबन्धी) and thus abandon its own meaning. Where as पुरुष without giving up its meaning separates the king from अश्व and others. In this way difference is seen from compounds. When the word राज्ञः is uttered it includes all the belongings of the king. When we say पुरुषः, all masters come into picture. When we say राजपुरुषः the kings property will be only the पुरुष, not horse etc. The master of the puruṣa will be king alone and none else. In this way संसर्ग (association) becomes समासवाक्य.

When both भेद and संसर्ग are considered at the same time, both become the meanings of the compound. When भेद becomes the meaning of the vṛtti, the expression राजपुरुषः will mean अराजकीय भिन्नः or राज भिन्न असंबन्धी.

If भेद is not the meaning of the vrtti, then we will have the usage राजपुरुषः देवदत्तस्य like the accepted usage राजपुरुषः सुन्दरः. If भेद becomes the meaning of the compound then the meaning of the compound राजपुरुषः, like राजभिन्न संबन्धि भिन्नः पुरुषः will not be the same as the meaning राजभिन्नदेवदत्त संबन्धी. Hence there will not be any दोष (faults)

If भेद has to be seen, the knowledge of संसर्ग is necessary. Hence संसर्ग which exists first becomes the meaning of the compound. The रासजयम्बन्धवान् पुरुषः will be the शाब्दबोध.

It is said that भेद comes later by inference. भेद is अनुमेय. संसर्ग is वाच्य or expressive or संसर्ग is अभेद and भेद is vācya. But there is no proof to prove any of these. To avoid using राजपुरुष in the case of a man who does not have any master both भेद and संसर्ग are considered as समासवाच्य.

If भेद is not accepted as समासार्थ then there is provision for the usage राजपुरुषः देवदत्तस्यच. But there is proof to say that भेद is समासार्थ. If संसर्ग is not accepted as समासार्थ, then the पुरुष without a स्वामि has राजभिन्न असम्बन्धित्व and hence the usage राजपुरुषः is approved. Therefore both भेद and संसर्ग have to be accepted as the meaning of a compound. Then राजपुरुषः means अराजकीयभिन्नः and also रजसम्बन्धवान् (च).

Further, to establish एकार्थीभाव or unitary meaning, K points out some mistakes in अजहत्सवार्थ. According to K there is power to convey meaning in समुदाय only. He gives examples like पङ्कज. The समासविधायकसूत्रs- rules which enjoin sāmasa give us the knowledge of compounds. Therefore समास is पदविधि - पदमुद्दिश्य यो विधीयते समासादिः स समर्थः, विग्रहवाक्याभिधाने शक्तः सन् साधुः इति.

The word समास refers to all the vrttis - कृत्तद्धित समास एकशेष सनाद्यन्त धातुरूपाः पञ्चवृत्तयः.

In पङ्कज, पद्मत्व or the property of being a lotus is accepted. Similarly अतिरिक्तशक्ति has to be accepted in all the vṛttis in general. सविशेषणानां वृत्तिः न. Those with adjectives will not get vrittis. Hence the notion of unitary meaning in vrttis has been accepted.

What is the nature of पदविधि ? The suffix by which the पदसंज्ञा or the word symbol is given, that प्रत्यय is प्रयोजक for पदसंज्ञा. In राजपुरुषः the सुप्प्रत्यय leads to पदसंज्ञा The cause for this सुप् प्रत्यय to set in, is the प्रातिपदिकसंज्ञा. The rule कृत्तद्धितसमासाश्च is a संज्ञाविधायक सूत्र. Therefore in the words पाचकः (कृत्) etc. औपगवः (तद्धित) etc. सु

is the suffix, the base for this is the प्रातिपादिक संज्ञा which sets in by the rule कृत्तद्धितसमासाश्च. Now the purpose is achieved from the rules ण्वुल्, तृचौ, तस्यापत्यं. Therefore these are also पदविधिs. Even एकशेष is पदविधि.

समुदायशक्ति or power in the whole is accepted by all in पङ्कज. Similarly in चित्रगुः etc (for the knowledge चित्रगोस्वामि) power in the whole has to be accepted. लक्षणा cannot be accepted. Infact पङ्कज is an example of योगरूढ. Similarly in रथकारः etc.

घटत्व or the property of being a pot is the adjective for घट. By तात्पर्य there is नित्यत्वान्वय - 'the concordance of the property of being eternal'. To avoid the usage घटोनित्यः पदार्थः पदार्थेन अन्वेति नतु पदार्थैकदेशेन. By this maxim the argument of the advocates of the - व्यपेक्षा theory is clear. Hence this may be taken as brief. That's why Patanjali has said - इमे तर्हि एकार्थीभावकृताः विशेषः - संख्या विशेषः, व्यक्ताभिधानं, उपसर्जनं विशेषणं च योगाः (2.1.1) and made it clear that these are the viśeṣas for एकार्थीभाव.

By the theory of एकार्थीभाव, (the notion of unitary meaning) the तद्धित and सनादि vṛttis have been established. By the theory of व्यपेक्षा, a vākya has been established. Here the two rules समर्थानां प्रथमाद्वा (4.1.82) and धातोः कर्मणः समानकर्तृकात् इच्छायां वा are applied (3.1.7). By वा we get वचन आनर्थक्यं. The भाष्यकार states - स्वभावतः एतत् भवति. Hence, first he gives व्यपेक्षापक्ष, then gives एकर्थीपक्ष as - अथ एकस्निन् व्यपेक्षायां सामर्थ्ये योऽसौ एकाथीभावः कृतः विशेषः स व्यक्तव्यः. If we concede the second, then the viśeṣa in एकार्थीभाव has to be stated. This leads to गौरव. Thus एकार्थीभाव or the notion of unitary meaning is accepted in vṛttis in general.

To justify the theory of एकार्थीभाव, Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa points out a few faults in the theory of व्यपेक्षा.

(i) If the theory of व्यपेक्षा is accepted then to convey the notion of relation in adjectives etc, separate numbers have to be used. This leads to गौरव. K has given some more examples. (1) धवखदिरौ - धवश्च खदिरश्च (here इतरेतरयोग is seen). (2) निष्कौशाम्बिः-कौशाम्ब्यां निष्क्रान्तः (क्रान्तार्थ is seen) (3) गौरथः - गोभिः युक्तः रथः (Here युक्तार्थ is seen) (4) घृतघटः - घृतपूर्णः घटः (पूर्णार्थ) (5) गुडधानाः - गुडमिश्राः धानाः (मिश्रार्थ) (6) केशचूडाः - केश संघातः चूडाः (संघात्रार्थ) (7) सुवर्णालङ्कारः - सुवर्णविकारः अलङ्कारः (विकारार्थः) (8) द्विदशाः - द्विरावृत्ता दशा (सुच् लोप) (9) सप्तपर्णः सप्तसप्त पर्णानि यस्य सः (वीप्सार्थ).

In all the above cases, to get the meaning of the विग्रहवाक्य words like क्रान्त etc are used. Similarly even in the vrtti, to get the knowledge of the respective meanings certain words have to be used. Then the elisions have to be stated for them. Then it may be stated that धवखदिरौ by itself conveys the meaning. In धवश्च खदिरश्च, elision for चकार has to be stated in the vrtti. This is the case in all the above examples. This leads to गौरव.

In चकारादि, the word आदि means, in घन इव श्यामः घनश्यामः, हंस इव गमनं यस्य सः - हंसगमनः, elision has to be stated for the particle इव.

Another defect in the theory of व्यपेक्षा is बहुव्युत्पत्तिभञ्जनं (or violation of many principles). For ex. in चित्रः गावः यस्य सः चित्रगुः

the well known meaning is चित्रगोस्वामि. To get this meaning of स्वामि etc. one has to take resort to एकार्थीभाव . But this is the doctrine of the grammarians. Naiyāyikas use लक्षण or secondary means which violates many other nyāyās. In the case of राजपुरुषः, चित्रगुः etc. लक्षणा may help to arrive at the required meaning. But in प्राप्तोदकः ग्रामः and other similar usages, लक्षणा is not applicable.

In प्राप्तोदकः ग्रामः - 'A village that has got water' प्राप्तं उदकं यं सः प्राप्ति कर्तृ अभिन्न उदकं is the meaning conveyed. The root आप् with the prefix, 'प्र' gets क्तप्रत्यय in कृत्यर्थ by the rule गत्यर्थाकर्मक (3.4.72). Here प्राप्त means प्राप्तिक्रियाकर्ता. This meaning gets अभेदसम्बन्ध with the word उदक. Then the meaning would be प्राप्ति कर्तृ अभिन्नं उदकं. But not the desired meaning namely - उदक कतृक प्राप्ति कर्म ग्रामः.

According to व्यपेक्षा theorists, even if the meaning, 'उदक सम्बन्धि ग्राम' is given by secondary means, the word प्राप्तोदक does not give the meaning उदक कर्तृक प्राप्तिकर्म. But gives the meaning प्राप्तिकर्त्रभिन्नः उदक सम्बन्धिग्रामः. Even if the word ग्राम shows the meaning उदकसम्बन्धी by secondary means, ग्राम will not be understood as कर्म or object for प्राप्ति.

If the meaning 'प्राप्तिकर्मग्रामः' is given by लक्षणा in the sense of karma for the कर्त्रर्थक क्त प्रत्यय in प्राप्त, then the meaning of the two nominal bases प्राप्त and उदक have to agree by अभेदसम्बन्ध as per the rule - समानाधिकरण प्रातिपदिकार्थयोः अभेद एव संसर्गः. Then the meaning would be उदकाभिन्न प्राप्तिकर्म. But this is not accepted. Though उदक as agent concords with प्राप्ति kriyā, as the non-differential relation is not present in them, it violates the above rule. Moreover, नामार्थयोः

भेदेन साक्षात् अन्वयः अव्युत्पन्नः - 'there is no direct concordance by differentiated relation between the senses of two prātipadikas.' If there is a different case (विभक्ति), then भेदसम्बन्ध is accepted.

As प्राप्ति is the meaning of धातु, if by कर्त्रर्थरूपभेद सम्बन्ध, the agreement between them is effected then, the rule नामार्थधात्वर्थयोः साक्षात् भेदेन अन्वयः अव्युत्पन्नः will be violated. If this rule is not accepted, when देवदत्तः is stated in the place of देवदत्तेन, in the sentence देवदत्तः पच्यते, though there is अन्वय of देवदत्त in पाक by the relation of being the agent, the desired well known concordance is not achieved.

To avoid this defect the NKs say - there is अभेदान्वय between the agent, the meaning of the क्तप्रत्यय in प्राप्त and the word उदक. The agent concords with प्राप्ति by वृत्तित्व सम्बन्ध - 'उदकाभिन्न कर्तृक प्राप्तिः'. Then by लक्षणा, the knowledge will be 'तत्सम्बन्धिग्रामः'. This is the view of the NKs.

Well, if the agent, the meaning of the suffix 'क्त' becomes adjective to प्राप्ति , the meaning of the verbal root, then, it violates the principle - 'प्रकृतिप्रत्ययार्थयोः प्रत्ययार्थस्यैव प्राधान्यम्'. In the word प्राप्ति, the viśeṣya is प्राप्ति itself. As it is नामार्थ, there has to be non-differentiated concordance of नामार्थ with the meaning of उदक, according to the principle - 'नामजन्य प्रतीति विशेष्ययोः अभेदान्वयः'.

In the case of द्वितीयार्थबहुव्रीहि, there is no fault. But K.Bh. shows defects in तृतीयार्थ and other bahuvrihis. For ex. ऊढरथः रथः येन सः(तृ.ब.) यत् कर्तृक वहन कर्माभिन्नः रथः and उपहृतः पशुः - उपहृत पशुः यस्मै सः (चतु.ब.) - यदुद्दश्यक उपहार कर्मीभूतः पशुः - उद्धृतः ओदनः यस्य सः -

उद्धृतौदना (पञ्चंब) - यदवधिक उद्धरण कर्माभिन्नः ओदनः - बहवः पाचकः यस्यां सा - बहुपाचिका (सप्त.ब.) यदभिकरण वृत्ति बहुत्व संख्याविषिष्टाभिन्न पाचकाः will be the meaning obtained according to the theory of व्यपेक्षा.

In the theory of एकार्थीभाव , according to the rule 'समानाधिकरणप्रातिपदिकयोः अभेद एव संसर्गः' the meaning of a compound is understood by अभेदसम्बन्ध' - the knowledge gained in the above cases would be -

रथकर्मक वहन कर्त्रभिन्नः अनड्वान्; पशुकर्मक उपहरणौद्देश्याभिन्नः रुद्रः, ओदन कर्मक उद्धरणावधि अभिन्ना स्थाली, बहुपाक कर्त्रधिकरणाभिन्ना नगरी.

In the theory of व्यपेक्षा, all the defects mentioned so far are present in all the examples given. Therefore the principle of unitary meaning in compounds has to be accepted. K.Bh. gives another example.

In the case of the word घट, the power is in घटत्वविशिष्टघटज्ञान. There is no separate awareness of घटत्व and of घट. If अतिरिक्तशक्ति is accepted in examples like प्राप्तोदकः, the meaning उदककर्तृक प्राप्तिकर्म comes from समुदायशक्ति - power in the group as उदक कर्तृक प्राप्ति कर्म. From विशिष्टविषयकज्ञ्ज्ञन - the knowledge of the whole subject, comes विशिष्ट विषयक शाब्दबोध - the verbal knowledge of the whole subject. If अवयवार्थ or the meaning for the individual word is there, then only the above stated principles of the NKs will operate. In the case of समुदायशक्ति there is no violation of any principles.

साधकान्तरमाह .... वाक्यार्थः - K.Bh. gives one more reason to justify अतिरिक्त शक्ति in vṛttis. In the kārikā अषष्ट्यर्थबहुव्रीहौ - the word षष्ठी also stands for सप्तमी. As in षष्ठ्यर्थ बहुव्रीहि, there is no need to state any special rule for the seventh case bahuvrithi. Other than these two, the rest should be allowed to have अतिरिक्तशक्ति Hence the kārikā questions, why not have power in the group (समुदाय), every where ? K.Bh. explains the same. In चित्रगुः etc. the sense चित्रगोस्वामि is not revealed without अतिरिक्त शक्ति. If secondary sense is given to the word चित्र, the awareness will be 'चित्रस्वामी गौः', If लक्षणा is given to the word गो, the resulting knowledge will be गोस्वामीचित्रः, or if secondary sense is given to the word चित्र as चित्रस्वामी and for गो in the sense of गोस्वामी, as the words चित्र and गो form a part of the word (एकदेश), there is no concordance for गो etc in एकदेश, due to the opposition from the rule 'पदार्थः पदार्थेन....'

It is not right to say that by लक्षणा the sense गोस्वामि is gained by the word गो after concordance like चित्राभिन्ना गौः, by non-differentiated agreement between चित्र and गो by the power seen instantly. As, there is no certainty about the word for which secondary sense has to be given, लक्षणा is not relevant.

If the NKs say that the direct relation of the form स्वत्वनिरूपितस्वामित्व is the principle to give secondary meaning to the word गो then, it may solve the problem in चित्रगुः etc. but in अषष्ठ्यर्थ bahuvrīhis like प्राप्तोदकः, कृतः विश्वः येन सः कृतविश्वः etc, as the sense, agent etc. are given to the यौगिकपदs (grammatically derived words) and as directed relation exists in both, and as there is no basis, to decide which word is तात्पर्यग्राहक and which word should be given secondary sense, it is not possible to get the right meaning by लक्षणा.

The NKs say that, according to the maxim 'प्रत्ययाणां सन्निहित पदार्थगत स्वार्थ बोधकत्वम् in प्राप्तोदकः etc secondary sense is given to the last word उदक etc. This is not correct, as bahuvrīhi is a group of words which conveys अन्यपदार्थ. If only the उत्तरपद conveys the अन्यपदार्थ, then it will not gain the symbol of bahuvrihi. अनेकं अन्यपदार्थे (2.2.4) defines a bahurvihi. According to the theory of व्यपेक्षा, as the knowledge of अन्यपदार्थ does not come from a group of subantas, bahuvrīhi itself will not set in.

If the NKs say that the earlier word being तात्पर्यग्राहक of the लक्षणा in the last word, and as अन्यपदार्थ is present, there is not obstacle for bahuvrihi to set in. In that case, i.e. if the last word is expressive, then in words घट etc. the last letter becomes expressive and the earlier letters have to become तात्पर्यग्राहक. And by hearing only the last letter, there has to be the awareness of the meaning. Similarly by hearing the word उदक, the meaning should be revealed. This topic has been discussed in greater detail in भूषणसार.

Hence to avoid this defect in अषष्ठ्यर्थ bahuvrihi, power in the group has to be accepted. The word तत् in the karika means तस्मात्. Hence अतिरिक्त शक्ति should be accepted in all compounds.

यत्तुः .... इत्याहुः - Now K.Bh. discusses the nature of the theory of व्यपेक्षा put forth by the NKs and MKs. They do no accept power in the group in any of the vrittis. The विशिष्टार्थ comes from लक्षणा. As the word राजन् has the sense राजसम्बन्धी, there is no concordance of adjectives like शोभनस्य etc. with the word राजन्. The words इव, क्रान्त etc. do not appear in the compounds. Moreover, in the beginning of समासप्रकारण, Pāṇini has given the rule विभाषा (2.1.11), which is called महाविभाषा. As this is applicable to both समास and विग्रहवाक्य, the व्यपेक्षा theorists have no need for this rule. Those who want समास get the meaning राज सम्बन्धि अभिन्नः पुसषः by लक्षणा and those who want vigrahavākya get it as राजसम्बन्धवान् - As there are no cases after words in a समास, the concordance is not by differentiated relation. As genetive case is there in vigrahavākya the concordance is by the relation of आश्रयता.

In the case of words like पङ्कज, even those who do know the parts as पङ्क-जन्-ङ understand its meaning. It cannot be said that the meaning comes by लक्षणा. When there is no knowledge of शक्यार्थ, there is no लक्षणार्थ also. Hence, total meaning has to be accepted here. But in राजपुरुष etc. without the knowledge of parts, there is no knowledge of the whole. Therefore, through the expressed meaning of the parts, secondary sense has to be accepted, not power in the group.

In the compound प्राप्तोदक, it has already been explained, why secondary sense has to be given to the last word namely उदक. In the case of words like घट etc. as the will of God is in the whole, the अतिरिक्त शक्ति comes from the whole and in every letter. Moreover, the last letter in घट does not have independent meaning, where as in प्राप्तोदक, the word उदक has its own meaning. Therefore there is no fault in giving secondary meaning to it. But those who think, that they are MKs accept the चरमवर्ण as expressive.

अत्रोच्यते .... अनुभवात् - Here the reasons shown before for accepting समुदायशक्ति is discussed.

अथ... विस्तरः - Here the views of the advocates of the व्यपेक्षा theory is summed up. The necessity of the word अर्थवत् in the rule is explained. By inference, the प्रातिपदिक gives the meaning of the compound.

Further K.Bh. gives examples to support समुदायशक्ति. In पङ्कजमानय, दण्डिनं पश्य, शूलिनं पूजय etc. in the words पङ्क, दण्ड and शूल as there is प्रकृतित्व आश्रयत्व, they concord with आनयन, दर्शन and पूजन respectively.

As दण्ड etc are adjectives, by the rule - प्रधान अप्रधानयोः कार्यसंप्रत्ययः, the प्रधानs, दण्डी etc. agree with action. The unimportant or adjectives namely दण्ड etc. do not concord with kriyā. Hence there is no fault.

If so, in usages like पाकात् नीलः , धर्मात् सुखी etc. there won't be agreement between the अप्रधान 'पाक and धर्म' in नील, सुख. In नीलत्व and सुखत्व which concord as विशेषण in स्वाश्रय, there will not be any concordance with पाकान् and धर्मात् the cause in ablative.

In प्रकृत्यर्थान्वित स्वार्थबोधकत्वं', it is not a must, that the sense of the प्रकृति should be the subject for the knowledge resulting from प्रकृति due to vrttis. It is enough if it becomes the subject for the knowledge coming from प्रकृति in any manner. Such a प्रकृत्यर्थ in उपकुम्भ, अर्धपिप्पली etc. exists in the पूर्वपद. Hence there is no fault.

In that case, in घटं पश्य etc. due to intimate relation with आकाश the second case should agree with आकाश. To ward off this fault, the word 'from वृत्ति' has to be included. But this is also not correct.

It has already been stated that प्रकृत्यर्थ is the one close to the प्रत्यय. Then in घटं पश्य there is no अन्वय with आकाश. In दण्डिनं पश्य, as there is no विशेष्यता in दण्ड, there is no दर्शनकर्मत्व But this is also not correct. In गां आनयति कृष्णः दण्डेन, the word दण्डेन in the third case has to concord with कृष्ण, as it has तृतीयाप्राग्वर्तित्व. Hence समुदायशक्ति has to be accepted.

Regarding एकदेशान्वय, in exs like दास्याः पुत्रः there is अलुक् for षष्ठी by the rule षष्ठ्या आक्रोशे (6.3.21). Hence there is no basis for लक्षणा as relation is shown by षष्ठी itself. There is अन्वय of सुन्दरी etc. with दास्याः. If power is accepted in समास this fault will not come.

As the एकार्थीभाव has been accepted in the Mīmāmsa śāstra, the statements that it is not right to give importance to भक्षण in 'वषट् कर्तुः प्रथमभक्ष्यः' becomes relevant. (3rd chap. 3rd पाद, 10th अधिकरण). Again in 10th chap. and third pāda, it is stated that - त्र्यङ्गैः स्विष्टकृतं यजति, 'to state त्रित्व by अङ्गानुवाद violates एकार्थीभाव. Hence the statement 'it is not correct', also becomes relevant. If प्रथमः is separated for the purpose of concordance then there will be no समास as this is called 'एकप्रसरताभङ्ग'. एकप्रसरता means समुदायार्थ. The power responsible for this is एकार्थीभाव. भङ्ग is obstacle for such a power.

Even in त्र्यङ्गैः etc. only there is taken for concordance. This is also disturbs एकार्थीभाव. Hence, त्रित्व विशिष्ट अङ्गान्तर has to be stated. This is the decision of the Mīmāmsakas. If power in the अवयवs is accepted, then there won't be any वाक्यभेद प्रसङ्ग and as a result, the doctrine of the Mīmāmsakas becomes irrelevant.

If power in the whole is accepted then even the famous अरुणाधिकरण of the MKs becomes relevant. Thus even the MKs should accept अतिरिक्तशक्ति in compounds.

राजपुरुषः इत्यादौ .... असि इति भावः - After proving समुदायशक्ति K.Bh. has stated the kārikā ' आख्यातं तद्धितकृतो' . He explains the relation between the earlier work and this kārikā.

व्यास means विग्रहवाक्य. There should be similar meaning for समास and its विग्रहवाक्य. So for राजपुरुषः, the vigraha would be राजाचासौ पुरुषश्च. राजा means राजसम्बन्धी by लक्षणा. Then the meaning would be 'राजसम्बन्धी अभिन्नः पुरुषः '. Here as the same meaning comes from both समास and विग्रहवाक्य, it is stated that there is समानार्थ between व्यास-समास. If it is राज्ञः पुरुषः, षष्ठी has the sense of स्वत्व सम्बन्ध. स्वत्व concords with पुरुष by the relation of आश्रयता and the knowledge would be राजनिरूपित स्वत्ववान् पुरुषः Hence there is no समानार्थ for व्यास-समास. Similarly there is no समानार्थ for व्यास-समास in चित्राः गावः यस्य सः. Therefore it should be चित्राणां गवां अयं. But by शेषो बहुव्रीहिः (2.2.23), it would be चित्राः गावः यस्य सः - चित्रगुः समास is enjoined by the rule षष्ठी (2.2.8), राज्ञः पुरुषः will be the sentence optimally. As राज्ञः पुरुषः, चित्राः गावः यस्य सः have no similar meanings with their respective समासपदs, they are not the vigrāhavākyas. K.Bh. refutes this view of the MKs in the kārikā.

'आख्यातं तद्धित कृतोः... - आख्यात means तिङन्त (verb) reveals, to some extent the meaning of तद्धितान्त and कृदन्त forms. The विशेषण-विशेष्य भाव विपर्यय for व्यास-समास is well known in the world. For ex. both in अक्षिकः - a तद्धितान्त and कुम्भकारः - a कृदन्त, the agent who is the substratum for action is प्रधान. व्यापार becomes अप्रधान. Then the knowledge gained would be अक्षकरणकव्यापाराश्रयः and कुम्भ उत्पत्यनुकूल व्यापाराश्रयः. But if तिङन्त is there, व्यापार becomes प्रधान and the agent, अप्रधान. In अक्षैः दीव्यति - अक्षकरणिका देवतानुकूला भावना and in कुम्भं करोति - कुम्भ उत्पत्यनुकूला भावना would be the knowledge gained.

Even the MKs do not care for the difference in the explanation of गुण-प्रधान भावांश, though they give prominence to kārakā in कृत् प्रत्ययs and भावना in तिङन्तs. Therefore, there is no objection for चित्राः गावः यस्य सः.

विपर्यय is of two kinds as समानाधिकरण and व्यधिकरण. देवदत्तस्य स्वभावविपर्ययः is an example for समानाधिकरण विपर्यय. चैत्र स्वभावात् मैत्रस्य स्वभावः विपरीतः is an example for व्यधिकरण विपर्यय. The second विपर्यय is meant for वृत्ति-विग्रह. But here it is the first विपर्यय. The vigrahavākya conveying the meaning of vritti is not responsible in the same way as the तिङन्तवाक्यs like अक्षैः दीव्यति which are for भावना विशेष्यक बोध. The vigrahavākya which gives the meaning of समास is responsible for conveying agent etc like तद्धितान्त and कृदन्त words. Hence there is no violation of similar meanings for vritti and vigraha.

ननु ...... इति दिक् ...

Objection - If power is accepted in समास and the vigrahavākya चित्राः गावः यस्य सः then as the power is in the form of unitary sense in षष्ठी तत्पुरुष - कर्मधारयs, there is violation of the doctrine of 'निषाद स्थपति अधिकरण'. One born to a Brahmin and a Sūdra woman is a

निषाद. Then the question is whether the phrase निषादस्थपति in the sentence 'निषादस्थपतिं याजयेत्' is a कर्मधारय or तत्पुरुष ? or बहुव्रीहि ? It is said to be कर्मधारय. लक्षणा has to be resorted to in तत्पुरुष and बहुव्रीहि, which leads to गौरव. This has been confirmed in this chapter. If एकर्थीभाव is accepted, as अतिरिक्त शक्ति is present in all compounds there is no need for लक्षणा, and the discussion about लाघव and गौरव is not required.

By the statement 'निषादस्थपतिं याजयेत्', the meaning that he can acquire the knowledge required for याग is understood. फलमुखगौरव is not गौरव. To clear this point, K.Bh. states the next kārikā.

पर्यवस्यच्छाब्दबोधा - पर्यवस्यं चासौ शाब्दबोधश्च - तस्मात्, अविदूरश्चासौ प्राक्षणश्च - Based on this, it is taken as कर्मधारय. निषादश्चासौ स्थपतिश्च (कर्मधारय), निशाधानां स्थपतिः (तत्पुरुषः) निषादः स्थपतिः यस्य सः (बहुव्रीहि), in all these ways it conveys meanings. Then the phrase निशादस्थपति has to become a polysemic word. Then, by the rule 'नानार्थे तात्पर्यात् विशेषावगतिः' the sense निषादरूपस्थपति is accepted, due to brevity, even before the समास. Though there is extra meaning in तत्पुरुष and बहुव्रीहि, as it is not intended, and as the desire is in the first simple meaning, it is brief to give the meaning of कर्मधारय. It is accepted that through तात्पर्य the संयोग-विप्रयोगs decide the meaning. By the word आदि in स्वरादयः even लाघव is an अर्थनिर्णायक.

As, many powers are not found in compounds, according to the MKs, how can there be many meanings ? That is, due to तात्पर्यानुपपत्ति, लक्षणा sets in. In काकेभ्यो दधिरक्ष्यताम् there is लक्षणा due to तात्पर्यानुपपत्ति. Even in निषादस्थपति, though there is no अन्वयानुपपत्ति in बहुव्रीहि and तत्पुरुष, लक्षणा is needed in षष्ठ्यर्थसम्बन्धविशिष्टार्थ (the whole meaning by the relation of षष्ठी), and in अन्यपदार्थविशिष्टार्थ the whole meaning comprising अन्यपदार्थ.

Thus तात्पर्य is the rule to regulate लक्षणा.

Objection - The word स्थपति conveys the meanings 'स्वामि' or 'श्रेष्ठ', hence, expressive of गुण. Therefore, in कर्मधारयसमास the word स्थपति should be stated first.

Reply - As the पूर्वनिपातप्रकरण is not permanent, there is no पूर्वनिपात for the word स्थपति or as the rule राजदन्तादिषु परं (2.2.31) has given परनिपात for the words in that गण and as the word निषादस्थपति is included in राजदन्तादिगण, the word स्थपति has परनिपात.

End of the chapter on Samāsa Śakti

अथ शक्तिनिर्णयः

The nature of Word - Power

In the last chapter Kounḍa Bhaṭṭa established अतिरिक्त शक्ति in समासs or separate power in compounds by stating 'समासे खलु भिन्नैव शक्तिः' Now, according to the maxim 'एक सम्बन्धि ज्ञानं अपरसम्बन्धिनः स्मारकं' by recalling power in words like घट etc. K. explains in this chapter the nature of शक्ति or power.

शक्तिप्रसंगात् .... नैवशक्तिः इत्यर्थः - The words which do not have the knowledge of vṛtti related to meaning will not give any meaning and it cannot give any verbal knowledge. The knowledge revealed by शब्द or word is called शाब्दबोध. The meaningful words lead to verbal knowledge. The meaning that is revealed is the कार्य or result. The knowledge of meaning comes only after the word is used.

There are two causes for शाब्दबोध. Firstly, the listener should hear the words clearly. Secondly, the knowledge of the vritti namely शक्ति (expressed meaning), लक्षणा (secondary meaning) and व्यञ्जना, (suggested meaning) and which of these the speaker intends to convey should be clear to the hearer.

The व्यापार or function by which a word conveys its meaning is called vritti. According to the NKs, Vṛtti is of two kinds as शक्ति and लक्षणा.

शक्ति or power is ईश्वरसंकेत the sign provided by God. Symbol given by the writers of śāstras is called परिभाषा. The word which expresses meaning by power is called वाचक or expression. The words नदी, वृद्धि etc. convey meaning through परिभाषा (or meta rules). Hence they are called पारिभाषिक words. A word which conveys meaning by means other than शक्ति - power and परिभाषा - metarules, through सादृश्य - similarity etc. is called लाक्षणिक or secondary. 'A word has to convey a particular meaning' is the will of God. The will of God is संकेत - symbol. संकेत alone is शक्ति - power. लक्षणावृत्ति is related to the expressed meaning. The cause for लक्षणा is तात्पर्यानुपपत्ति - fault in the total meaning and not 'अन्वयानुपपत्ति' or fault in concordance. In गङ्गायां घोषः the word घोषः means, crocodile, by लक्षणा and it has agreement. Therefore तात्पर्यानुपपत्ति is लक्षणा.

According to grammarians vrtti is of two kinds as शक्ति and व्यञ्जना. Now K explains the nature of power according to the doctrine of grammarians.

इन्द्रियाणां .... This kārikā explains the nature of शक्ति or power which is अनादि - beginning less and the relation present in शब्द - word and अर्थ meaning.

As शब्द and अर्थ are mutually related with power the grammarians reject the theory of 'power in the form of God's will'. The first half of the kārikā illustrates this with an example. The knowledge gained by the senses like eyes etc. is the kārya. The sense organs are the causes. Similarly, in words also there is the property of conveying meaning which is beginning less. That is called योग्यता. That alone is power. The capacity of the objects pot etc. is the power in words like घट etc. The relation between word and its meaning is योग्यता. This power is another form of the object itself and not ईश्वरेच्छा.

According to K.Bh.'s view - power is the property creating awareness of the form of the relation between word and its meaning which has no beginning.

ननु .... इति चेत् Objection - The property of being the cause for अनादिबोध is not power. Because, the names Devadatta etc. given by the father does not have the property of अनादि.

The property of being the cause for बोध is power. अनादित्व only conveys popularity. But even in लाक्षणिकपदs popularity being the cause, there is the fault of over application in the definition of power. In गङ्गायां घोषः power has to be accepted in the sense of bank for the word गङ्गा. To avoid this fault, one has to accept संकेतज्ञान also as the cause. Then, as there is no knowledge of the संकेत related with तीर the expressed meaning, there is no over application in लाक्षणिकपदs. In that case, let संकेत be power. In Devadatta etc. there is the संकेत given by the father, in टि, घि etc. the संकेत given by the writer and in गो etc. the संकेत given by God.

अत्रोच्यते ... भ्रान्तत्वापत्तेरिति - Reply - He refutes the view that संकेत is power. There are three options here. (1) Is संकेत the cause due to its special property like fire which burns even if it is not known (2) or Is संकेत, known in general, forms the cause ? (3) or Is सेंकेत known by its special form the cause ?

The first one is अज्ञानसंकेत which is not the cause by its form. Even if a person is not aware of the संकेत in a word, संकेत being present in the word, knowledge has to come. This is opposed to usage. The second one about knowledge in general is also wrong. प्रमेयत्व being सर्वान्वयि, even संकेत, as प्रमेय may have to be conveyed by such words. Even ईश्वरसंकेत is not the cause. In words like गो etc there is the will of God. But atheists and Mīmāmsakas do not accept God. When the संकेतकर्ता himself is not there, even संकेत does not exist. In this way the Mīmāmsakas, who do not have the knowledge of संकेत should not gain any meaning by words like गो etc. But they gain the knowledge of गो by those words. Then the definition of शक्ति becomes faulty due to कार्यसत्वे कारण असत्वात् .

Hence संकेत is not the cause of power. In that the special forms is not संकेतत्व. It is of the form अर्थज्ञानजनकतावच्छेदक of the respective words. In the word गो, the knowledge गोरूप अर्थविषयक बोधजनक is the cause for verbal knowledge. What is the form of जनकता ? According to the MKs - तत्तदर्थधी जनकतावच्छेदकत्वेन. Even for a person who does not have the knowledge that घट, means घटत्व विशिष्ट घट , the knowledge that it is useful to carry water comes on seeing some one carrying water in it. Similarly, though there is no knowledge of ईश्वर the giver of संकेत and the knowledge of this संकेत does not come through its special property yet the knowledge of संकेत comes in the form of अर्थधीनजकतावच्छेदक.

The word with संकेत is the cause for the knowledge of its meaning. संकेत exists as अवच्छेदक in the कारणता present in the word. Therefore there is nothing wrong in the view that संकेत is शक्ति

But when the special property is recognised, it leads to prolixity. Therefore, instead of अर्थधीजनकतावच्छेदकत्व प्रकारक ज्ञान it would be brief to say that the cause for शाब्दबोध is अर्थधीजनकत्व प्रकारक ज्ञान then बोधजनकत्वं शक्तिः would be the view desired by Kounḍa Bhaṭṭa.

Objection - But in modern words like Devadatta, knowledge comes, even without अर्थबोधजनकत्वज्ञान. Then there is violation of the rule कारणभावेकार्याभावः.

Reply - Even in words like Devadatta, the meaning that 'this word shall mean this' exists and अर्थबोधकत्व being the subject in the word, there is no violation. In every case of संकेत the knowledge of अर्थधीजनकत्व will be present.

Objection - Well, as stated above, in the इच्छारूपसंकेत the property of giving meaning exists in that knowledge also as an adjective through the relation of विषयिता. Thus in the knowledge of संकेत, the अर्थधीजनकत्व is not a direct subject. But it has to be stated that the knowledge अर्थबोधकत्व, which is independent and not an adjective to anything else will be the cause for verbal knowledge. Otherwise, anybody would be confused. For eg. Devadatta stated a vākya 'घटमानय' with the intention घटत्वविशिष्ट घटविषयक बोधजनक. But yajnadutta, who heard this sentence grasped it as - पटत्व विशिष्ट पटविषयकबोधजनक. When Devadatta realised this mistake and thought - if बोधजनकत्वज्ञान which shows itself as an adjective in the knowledge is the cause for शाब्दबोध, then in the confused state of knowledge as the subject पट was present in घट, even in the wrong knowledge, बोधजनकत्व being the subject, the knowledge of पट in घट has to come even for a right minded person.

Reply - In that case, even Yajñadutta who is thinking rightly has to be enveloped by illusion (भ्रान्ति)

इदं च साधारण्यात् - Objection - If the अर्थधीजनकत्व takes place after hearing the word, then शाब्दबोध has to bake place even by words whose knowledge of संकेत is not known.

Reply - The बोधकत्व intended by शक्तत्व should be understood only by the knowledge of संकेत by father and others. As संकेतज्ञान is the cause for शक्तिज्ञान there is no शाब्दबोध before संकेतज्ञान.

Objection - If बोधकरणत्व itself becomes power, then लक्षणावृत्ति becomes useless. The words घट, पट etc. are expressive words. The words वृद्धि-गुण are technical words, when both are not there, words which convey meaning due to similarity etc. are लाक्षणिकशब्द. लक्षणा is related to शक्य. It is of two kinds as शुद्धा and गौणी. शुद्ध is beyond similarity etc. ex. आयुर्घृतम्. गौणी is related to similarity - गौणीलक्षणा यथा - गौः वाहीकः - तात्पर्यानुपपत्ति is the seed of लक्षणा. For ex. गङ्गायां घोषः.

Reply - The meaning तीर for गङ्गा comes by power itself. Hence लक्षणा is not required. Power is of two kinds प्रसिद्धा and अप्रसिद्धा. By प्रसिद्धाशक्ति, गङ्गा means flood, by अप्रसिद्धाशक्ति it means bank. Here, the usage which is शक्तिग्राहक शिरोमणि is similar both in शक्यार्थ and लक्ष्यार्थ. Hence power has to be accepted for गङ्गा in both is the doctrine of the grammarians.

किञ्च .... अतिरिच्यते - Now K. explains how लक्षणावृत्ति leads to गौरव. The knowledge of power is the cause for शाब्दबोध. If लक्षणा is also accepted then there will be two kārya - kāraṇa bhāvas, which leads to गौरव. According to vaiyākaraṇās - the knowledge which comes due to power, is alone the cause for शाब्दबोध.

If there are two causes, then there is violation of the 'व्यतिरेक व्याप्तिकारणाभावे कार्याभावः. Both शक्ति and लक्षण cannot occupy the same place. Therefore, where ever there is cognition due to power, there is no cognition due to लक्षणा. Therefore fault occurs in every cause - effect notion.

Those who advocate लक्षणा state - शाब्दबोध is कार्य. उपस्थिति is the cause. उपस्थितिमत्व is कार्यतावच्छेदक. उपस्थितित्व is कारणतावच्छेदक In whatever relation the effect exists in its place of origin is called कार्यतावच्छेदक.

Similarly, by whatever relation the cause exists with the effect, is called कारणतावच्छेदक. Here by अव्ययहितोत्तरत्व सम्बन्ध, the शक्तिज्ञानजन्य उपस्थिति is the cause for the effect शक्तिज्ञानजन्य उपस्थिति विशिष्टशाब्दबोध. The same is the case with लक्षणा. Hence there is no fault. But this is not correct. Because, when we consider the individuals, then there will be infinite cause-effect notions, leading to गौरव.

Objection - For those who advocate शक्ति, due to difference in words like गङ्गा, जाह्नवी etc. there is difference in cause - effect notion. Again the word गङ्गा has different meanings like flood, bank etc. leading to different cause - effect notion. With the upholders of the लक्षणा theory also the fault of गौरव exists as, they have to go for तीर etc for प्रवाह. Further he shows the अन्योन्याश्रय in both.

अथ .... भूषणे -

नन्वेवं .... द्रष्टव्यं - If बोधजनकत्व is power, the fault can be avoided as follows - भाषा means अपभ्रंश words. If these words are used in

Yajñas it leads to sin - अपभ्रश्यते-पत्यते नरकादौ अनेन in this sense, घञ् has set in the sense of करणे and formed the word अपभ्रंशः . As there is power in them to convey meaning, they will have to get शब्दसाधुत्व. According to grammar, whatever is शक्त is साधु. But this has been expressed in two ways - अपभ्रंश words are not शक्त. साधुत्व is different from शक्तत्व.

असाधुरनुमानेन वाचकः कैश्चित् इष्यते ।
वाचकत्व अविशेषे वा नियमः पुण्यपापयोः ॥

The first half states the views of MKs and NKs. The words गावी etc. are असाधु. But by recalling the right word, the meaning may flash. Even for those without the knowledge of grammar due to शक्ति भ्रम , the असाधु words may convey meaning.

Bhartrhari has explained the views of the MKs and NKs in four kārikās in his vākyapadīya.

The असाधु शब्दs identify with साधुशब्दs and convey meaning. But the learned do not consider it as synonyms. Even lexicons don't give them as synonyms. Therefore असाधु words are not expressive directly.

Due to difference in place, there are many अपभ्रंश words. Hence to create power in them leads to गौरव. As अपभ्रंशs are अशक्तs, it cannot be said that - शक्तत्वं is साधुत्वं. The NKs and MKs follows the हारिकारिका and say 'तेसाधुरनुमानेन'. By the words वाचकत्वाविशेषेवा in the latter half. K.Bh gives his own view - There is no difference in the meaning conveyed by either साधु or असाधु words. But grammar says that one gives merit, the other leads to sin. But

वाचकत्व, expressiveness is the same for both. Hence the words of Patañjali that समानाया अर्थावगतौ शब्देन अपशब्देन च तत्र धर्म नियमः क्रियते शब्देनैव अर्थः अभिधेयः, न अपशब्देन इति, एवं क्रियमाणं अभ्युदयकारी भवतीति - becomes relevant.

इदानीं .... भूषणे - Even the illiterate gain meaning by hearing अपभ्रंश words. In fact they don't understand साधुशब्दs. Moreover, as there is no obstacle at any time in gaining meaning from अपभ्रंश words, it cannot be called भ्रम. Hence, the cognition is due to बोधकत्वरूपशक्तिभ्रम is not correct. It cannot be the second one also namely ईश्वरेच्छारूपशक्तिभ्रम. Because, it exists in all things, there is no obstacle for it to convey the same meaning always. Hence the power which exists between word and its meaning cannot be an illusion of any kind.

K.Bh. quotes two Harikārikās to show that अपभ्रंश s are expressive. The use of असाधु words from those incapable of proper pronunciation and from those who are not learned is well known in practice. असाधु words convey meaning directly and not from the memory of साधुशब्दs. The second kārikā says that - Sanskrit has changed due to the incapability of people to pronounce it rightly.

The NKs who consider शब्द as अनित्य, are of the view that only साधुशब्दs are expressive and not अपभ्रंश words. As there is no विनिगमक in this view, power has to be accepted even in अपभ्रंश words.

The बोधजनकतावच्छेदक in words is the आनुपूर्वि. This is applicable to both साधु and असाधु words. The only difference between the two is that the learned have stated that only साधुशब्द are expressive. This cannot be the reason to say that असाधु words are not expressive.

The भाष्य states - शवतिः गतिकर्मा कम्बोजेषु, विकारे एव एनं आर्याः भाषन्ते' - thus even Sanskrit has not been accepted uniformly by all scholars. Therefore every word is शक्त - expressive. But साधुशब्दs have been classified in lexicons etc. and it does not consider the अपभ्रंश words.

If it is said that, शक्तत्वं is साधुत्वं, then even अपभ्रंश words become साधुशब्दs. For this, Dīxita has said - नियमः पुण्यपापयोः. The rule is साधुभिः भाषितव्यम्. The same idea is stated in the Bhāṣya - शब्देनैव अर्थः अभिधेयः, न अपशब्देन एवं क्रियमाणं अभ्युदयकारी भवति, - 'एक शब्दः सम्यक् ज्ञातः शास्त्रान्वितः स्वर्गे लोके कामधुक् भवति. (6.1.84). The prohibition is 'असाधुभिः न भाषितव्यम्' Hence the पुण्यजनकता-वच्छेदकधर्म in साधु words is साधुत्व. The पापजनकतवावच्छेदक धर्म is असाधुत्व. साधुत्व is genus. The lexicon, grammar and usage teach us the right word.

In राजा राजसूयेन यजेत, the word राजा has the familiar sense of a kshatriya. Hence there is not right for a Brāhmin to perform that yāga. As साधुत्व determines the meaning, the word गो cannot mean अश्व. Hence in the rule मस्करमस्करीणौ वेणुपरिव्राजकयोः (6.1.154), the meaning is very clear. The word मस्कर is साधु in the sense of वेणु only. The word मस्करी is साधु in the sense of परिव्राजक. Usage is very important. Hence it is called शक्तिग्राहक शिरोमणि. Usage says that power for a word is in the individual only.

They symbolic words used at random like Devadatta etc.

become साधु. The Bhāṣya writes - दशम्युत्तर कालं पुत्रस्य जातस्य नाम विदध्यात्, घोषवदाद्यन्तरंतस्थं अकृद्धं त्रिपुरुषान्मूकं अनरिप्रतिशतं । तद्धिप्रतिष्ठ्यततमं भवति । द्व्यक्षरं चतुरक्षरं वा पुरुषस्य नाम कृतं कुर्यात् न तद्धितं - So, in whatever meaning, a word is grammatically derived, in that sense it is साधु.

In usages like सिंहोमाणवकः as the qualities like cruelty etc. present in the lion is imposed on the boy, they become साधुप्रयोगs. The modern लाक्षणिक शब्दs which do not come under the purview of the śāstra, become असाधु प्रयोगs. Hence the usage ब्राह्मणं देहि in the sense of ब्राह्मणाय देहि is not साधु even by लक्षणावृत्ति. All these are dealt with in detail in भूषणसार. Though अपभ्रंश words are expressive, as साधुत्व is the cause in śāstric usage, according to the rule अर्थवत् .... they do not get the symbol of the nominal base.

अतिरिक्त ... ग्राह्येत्यर्थः - Though the sources like lexicon, grammar etc. exist, to gain the knowledge of power, Dixita writes an other kārikā to indicate other sources for the same by the words सम्बन्धि शब्दे. Even if a person has not studied grammar, the knowledge of power in words is gained by usage. K.Bh. states that - The relation which exists in the form of power, in the concerned words, the compatibility which says that this word is related to this meaning, and this word is used in this sense - by all this, the knowledge of power in words is gained. Thus the knowledge of compatability comes from संकेत or by symbol. The knowledge of बोधकत्वरूपशक्ति comes from usage that 'this is related to this' समय means usage or व्यवहार.

End of the chapter on śakti.

नञर्थनिर्णयः

The meaning of nañ

Having decided about the nature of power now K.Bh discusses about the power of nañ in a nañ samāsa. नञ् is classified as a nipāta or particle. Yet the sense of नञ् being very important in usage according to the maxim 'ब्राह्मणवसिष्ठन्याय,' K.Bh deals with the sense of नञ् separately in this chapter. Even in his बृहद्वैय्याकरणभूषण, though he is silent about the meanings of other particles, he deals with नञ्.

There are two views regarding the sense of नञ्. One is direct negation and the other is āropa or super imposition.

Based on the first kārikā of Bhaṭṭoji, K. explains how āropa or superimposition could be the meaning of nañ in a nañ samāsa.

In examples like घटो न पटः and घटो नास्ति the verbal cognition of the sense of negation being obvious, it is necessary to accept the sense of negation for nañ. Anticipating this arguments K. writes-

In a nañ samāsa, aparasya means the latter member of the compound being important, the state of being a pronoun is secured. Therefore whatever is super imposed alone manifests negation. The idea is - In असर्वः etc. 'सर्व is superimposed' means, the importance of the sense of the word सर्व not being set aside, the property of being a pronoun is secured. Otherwise as in अतिसर्वः the pronoun sign will be lost, as a result the grammatical functions due for a pronoun do not set in. As a result the forms असर्वस्मै, असर्वस्मात् etc. cannot be secured.

In घटो नास्ति etc. the sense appears to be direct negation. As superimposition of a thing already existing is not done, the sense of negation is mentally realised, though not verbally. Āropa means the absence of the thing super imposed.

Negative judgement like 'घटो नास्ति' has been defined as the property which resides in the chief qualifier (प्रकार) of the counter positive. The generic character घटत्व - jarness is the अवच्छेदक of the counter positiveness (प्रतियोगिता) resident in the jar in as much as it happens to be the chief qualifier of the counterpositive घट. As āropa is against common experience, another view is stated - under the rule nañ, the M.Bh. questions किं प्रधानोऽयं समासः ? The meaning of the latter word is important in this compound. If so, then there is the chance of bringing only a Brahmin of hearing the expression अब्राह्मणमानय or भेदविशिष्ट ब्राह्मण ।

This cannot be, if the question is put - 'why is not a puruṣa alone brought, when some one is ordered to fetch a राजपुरुष ? Because, the word rāja specifies and hence राजपुरुष is fetched. Similarly it is नञ्विशिष्टब्राह्मणः - a Brahmin qualified by nañ. Here nañ means निवृत्तपदार्थकः । The affix 'kta' has set in by the rule नपुंसकेभावेक्तः (3.1.114). Therefore अब्राह्मण means ब्राह्मणभिन्नव्यक्तिः - 'an individual other than a Brahmin'.

Objection - If the sense of super imposition is not given to nañ then, in अब्राह्मणमानय, just like kshatriyas, stones etc. too being other than a Brahmin, may be brought.

Reply - This is against the Bhāṣya - 'न हि अब्राह्मणमानय इति उक्ते लोष्ठमानीय कृती भवति (3.11.12). Based on the context, the word अब्राह्मण indicates kshatriya and other special groups.

Though घट may have the power to indicate all pots, yet it refers to one particular pot in the vicinity.

There is controversy in the interpretation of the word निवृत्तपदार्थकः.

Kaiyaṭa writes - निवृत्तः पदार्थः मुख्यं ब्राह्मण्यं यस्मिन् निवृत्तपदार्थकः - due to resemblance etc. a kṣatriya and others in whom the property of being a Brāhmin is superimposed.

Objection - K. Does not agree with Kaiyaṭa, as it leads to गौरव since that is not the meaning expressed by nañ. To accept the sense of negation is conducive to brevity and it is also popular in usage. Otherwise even सादृश्य or similarity becomes the expressed meaning of नञ्. What is the meaning of नञ् ?

"Similarity with it, negation, other than that, its insignificance, its unimportance, being opposite are the six meanings of nañ."

Having stated gives the examples - अब्राह्मणः, अपापम्, अनश्वः, अनुदराकन्या, अपशवः and अधर्मः respectively.

If similarity etc. are not the expressed meanings of nañ how is Bhartṛhari's statement तत्सादृश्यम् etc. justified ? First there is the awareness of आरोपित ब्राह्मणत्व विशिष्ट etc. Then comes the sense of 'similarity', i.e. it flashes from the superimposed, which is the meaning of nañ. This is only mental called आर्थिकाः अर्थाः ।

The negation of the form नञर्थभेद - difference due to the sense of ब्राह्मण, सर्व becomes adjective to the counter position, ब्राह्मण , सर्व etc. Then the cognition would be भेद्रप्रतियोगिब्राह्मण. Thus the latter member ब्राह्मण becomes important and hence a तत्पुरुषसमास. Similarly in असर्व etc. सर्व being important, continues to have the pronoun sign and as result the forms असर्वस्मै etc. are achieved.

In support of आरोप as being the sense of nañ, K.Bh. cites two examples, अनेक and अनेकया (Megha. 4.42) where the latter word एक being important, is in singular. Even the Bhāṣya writes - इदं खल्वपि भूयः उत्तरपदार्थप्राधान्ये सति सङ्गृहीतम् भवति - 'if the latter word is considered important, then, the singular number for अनेकम् will also be achieved. Therefore there is fixing up of the person and number in अत्वंभवसि, अनहं भवामि etc.

अत्वं भवसि-भेदविशिष्ट त्वत्कर्तृक सत्ता अनहं भवामि-भेदविशिष्ट अस्मत्कर्तृक सत्ता. As the meaning of the pronouns युष्मद् and अस्मद् stand in apposition with the sense of तिङ्, the second and first persons are fixed.

Otherwise, like त्वदभावः, मदभावः due to युष्मद् and अस्मद् concording with the sense of negation and not with तिङ् affixes which are standing in apposition with युष्मद्, the fixing of person will not be achieved.

If the sense of nañ is considered as adjective to घट etc. then the counter positive of its difference being in घट, after the verbal comprehension, घट has to be brought. To avoid this fault another view is given.

विशेष्योवा .... If the difference due to the sense of nañ becomes the qualified in the counter positive, then in अब्राह्मणः the comprehension would be ब्राह्मणभिन्नः क्षत्रियः for असः-तद्भिन्नः, असर्वः - सर्वभिन्नः etc.

If the sense of nañ becomes qualified, then it does not come under the purview of the rules युष्मद्युपपद.... (4.1.105) and then as the rule शेषेप्रथमा comes into force, there is the danger of having III-person only in both अत्वम् and अनहम्.

The faults that occur in this case should be avoided from the indications of other rules.

The expression अनञ् समासे in एतत्तदोः ..... (6.1.132) indicates that the operations due to a pronoun takes place even if the meanings of the pronouns are secondary. There is one more proof for this from the rule अकरिति.... as अकच् enjoined on a pronoun does not set in being पर्युदास, it is grasped as pronoun only.

पर्युदासः स विज्ञेयो यत्रोत्तरपदेन नञ् ।
प्रसज्य प्रतिषेधोऽयं क्रियया सह यत्र नञ् ।
तत्र पर्युदासो भेदः, प्रसज्यप्रतिषेधोऽभावः ॥

(नञ्सूत्रे भाष्यकृतः)

घटाभाव is घटभिन्नमानय । नञर्थः प्रतियोगिनि विशेष्य इति । प्रतियोगिनिष्ठ विशेषणता निरूपित विशेष्यताश्रयो नञर्थः । स च क्रियायोगे अत्यन्ताभावः, अन्यत्र तु भेदः । प्रतियोगितया भेदविशिष्टब्राह्मणः क्षत्रियः - आरोप ब्राह्मणभिन्नः ब्राह्मणत्वस्य अभावः - अभावः । ब्राह्मणप्रतियोगिक भेदाश्रयः क्षत्रियः अथवा ब्राह्मणपदस्य ब्राह्मणभिन्ने लक्षणा । नञ् तु तात्पर्यग्राहकः ।

Objection - In the ex. अनेकः,if the sense of nañ is the qualifier as भेदस्य प्रतियोगि एकः, then there is singular number and also importance for the latter word.

If the sense of nañ becomes the qualified as in एकस्य भिन्नः - इत्यत्र अनेकः अपि च द्वित्रीणि अपि अर्थाः भवन्ति, then अनेक should have been either in dual or plural number. Moreover एकस्य भिन्नः इत्यत्र एकोऽपि अर्थः न स्यात्. Then even singular number will not come. How to justify Māgha's usage - 'पतन्त्यनेके जलधेरिवोर्मयः'.

Reply - In अनेकमन्यपदार्थे there is the extension of सुप् the qualified. अनेकम् becomes the qualifier. Hence singular has set in. If dual is taken as अनेके then the plural is excluded. If plural is taken as अनेकानि then बहुव्रीहि will not come for both. To achieve समास for 'two' and 'many words, singular is given optionally. जात्याभिप्राय means 'एकभिन्नत्वरूप सामान्यगत एकत्वाभिप्रयोण. Even in सेव्यते अनेकया the singular is in accordance with the qualified योषया and to show agreement with everyone having served Krishna and not due to the importance of the latter word.

(1) एकवचनम् उत्सर्गतः करिष्यते (2) पूर्वपदार्थ प्राधान्यादेव.

Here the sense of अनेक is एकभिन्नः If the sense is भेद प्रतियोगि - the counter positive of the difference then this sense cannot be given. Even in the example नैकस्तिष्ठति जनः, it is to show separateness. If not अनेको जनाः becomes wrong. Similarly the usage पतन्त्यनेके जलधेरिवोर्मयः etc. is justified.

In अत्वम् भवसि and अनहम् भवामि, the secondary sense would be त्वद्भिन्न and मद्भिन्न. Nañ being a manifestor, even भिन्न 'different form' happens to be the sense of युष्मद् and अस्मद् As the sense of तिङ् 'the verbal suffix' and the pronouns are standing in apposition, the second and first persons have set in.

युष्मद् and अस्मद् are jus examples. "According to the NKs in त्वद्भिन्न, the meaning is secondary. This is not accepted by the grammarians. Nañ being a manifestor, it is considered as the sense of युष्मद् and अस्मद् only. As आरोप is against the experience of all, अभाव or the secondary sense different from its own meaning is the sense of nañ in a नञ्समास.

Objection - If so, then the view that the latter member of a तत्पुरुष compound is important will be violated.

Reply - The statement that 'the latter member is important' is only a probability - उत्तरपदार्थप्राधान्यादि व्यपदेशस्तु प्रायिक इत्यपि बोध्यम्. Hence in the example अर्धपिप्पली, पूर्वकायः etc. the earlier words अर्ध and पूर्व are important and yet do not set aside the तत्पुरुषसमास. Moreover, the qualifier अनञ् समासे in the rule तत्तदोः.... helps to solve this problem. Similarly, person and number are regularised. In अत्वम् and अनहम् there is no need to take restor to secondary means as nañ being a manifestor, it is the meaning of the pronoun itself.

Now प्रसज्य प्रतिषेधार्थक or the sense of नञ् as direct negation is explained. In the example 'न त्वम् पचसि' if the sense of युष्मद् concords with the sense of नञ्, then the second person cannot be fixed. Then in what form is the import of अभाव grasped ? It can't be the characteristics of being अभाव. Because such a comprehension is not there in चैत्रः न पचति. Though on the basis of प्रसज्यप्रतिषेधत्व

अभाव is शक्यत्व or the limiter of import, it becomes faulty. Even difference being the subject of direct perception, अभाव is also the meaning of नञ्. A नञ् that is not in a compound shows agreement with verb only.

Import in negation should be imagined or created in any one of the four kinds of negation such as absolute negation, mutual negation etc. Comprehension in those respective forms is popular in the word.

End of the Chapter on nañartha.

निपातार्थनिर्णयः

The meaning of nipāta

Having determined the meaning of नञ् separately, K.Bh. now deals with the meaning of nipāta. Pāṇini's sūtra प्राग्रीश्वरान्निपाताः (1.4.56) defines a particle. This is included under indeclinables. स्वरादिनिपातमव्ययम् (1.1.37). All indeclinables are not particles. Hence, indeclinables like दिवा, नक्तम्, अन्तः, प्रातः etc. are expressive of meanings. Now the question is whether particles like च, किल, खलु etc. and prefixes like प्र, अनु, सम् etc. which are included under particles are expressive or not ? As they do not express any meaning by themselves but convey some specific meaning along with other words, they are manifestors of meaning and not expressive.

प्रादयो द्योतकाः ...... इति शेषः - K. straight away refutes the NKs and states that there is no reason in the argument of NKs and प्र etc are manifestors and च etc are expressive. He tries to show that all nipatas are manifestors. A manifestors is a verbal element which is not used except in association with an other word. It is not considered 'expressive' because it is not used independently. The reason for which प्र etc. are manifestors for similar reason च and other particles are also manifestors. Therefore in हरिहरौ उपास्येते, साक्षात्क्रियते गुरुः, उपास्यते गुरुः etc. the passive lakāra has set in.

In the example ईश्वरं अनुभवति, the meaning of the root भू cannot be अनुभव or experience as it would be applicable to भवति also. If it is the meaning of the suffix, then it is not the meaning of the root and the meaning of तिङ् does not concord with it. A प्रत्यय is that which concords with the meaning of प्रकृति and reveals its own meaning. If it is stated as उसर्गविशिष्टधातु or a root qualified by suffix then it leads to गौरव. Therefore the sense 'experiences' is got by secondary means. The distinction between primary and secondary in their meanings is based on प्रसिद्धि or अप्रसिद्धि. The prefix अनु is useful for grasping the total meaning. Hence the meaning conveyed by the two together is the same as the manifested meaning. This property of being a manifestor is the same with च and other particles. In the example 'looks like chaitra' the subject chaitra is qualified by the sense of similarity. The word इव is expressive of the total meaning.

In उपास्येते हरिहरौ the result of the form of worship is the meaning of उप and as the root अस् does not have this sense, the definition of a passive verb is not applicable. As there is no reading in भ्वादि for विशिष्ट, it will not gain even the root sign.

Hence, if उपासन is the meaning of धातु and उप conveys this total meaning then the property of being a manifestor to a nipāta is established. In that case, the root becomes the expression of action in a location different from that of the result. Hence the root becomes passive as उपास्येते. Therefore by 'लः कर्मणि' उपसर्गs are manifestors.

Nipātas are also manifesotrs in the same way as upasargas are manifestors. In examples like साक्षात्क्रियते, अलङ्क्रियते ऊरीक्रियते etc. when the meanings साक्षात्कार, अलङ्कार and स्वीकार respectively are stated as the meanings of the root कृ, then the passive lakāra is established. Then the meanings प्रत्यक्षानुकूलव्यापार or 'action leading to perception'; शोभनानुकूलव्यापार or 'action leading to beauty'; स्वीकृत्यनुकूल व्यापार or action leading to acceptance are respectively the meanings of the root कृ. Obviously, the root itself is clearly seen as the expression for the above meanings. The particles साक्षात् etc. here are manifestors of these meanings like उपसर्गs.

Though the root कृ is passive in the above senses, if they are shown as the meanings of nipātas, the root कृ loses its property of being passive.

Well, the NKs say that, in the example करोति घटम् as it is transitive, the root कृ becomes transitive every where.

Anticipating this reply Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa shows fault here. Then, in examples like वायुः विकुरुते, सैन्धवाः विकुर्वते etc. the root कृ will have to be transitive. Then by the rule अकर्मकाच्च (1.3.35) the ātmane termination will not set in. Even in वायुना विक्रियते, सैन्धवैः विक्रियते , the भावे termination will not come.

In साक्षात्क्रियते शिवः, if the result साक्षात्कार or perception is from nipāta and not of the root then, the passive lakāra will not set in according to लः कर्मणि. Then the definition 'स्वार्थफल व्यधिकरण व्यापार वाचकत्वं सकर्मकत्वम् will not be applicable. Then the object sign will not come for Śiva, as a result even the first case affix will not come.

Well, the NKs say that upasargas are manifestors and nipātas are expressive. As a proof for this, they quote the lexicon - साक्षात्प्रत्यक्षतुल्ययोः or साक्षात् and प्रत्यक्ष as of similar meanings. Here साक्षात्कार is the meaning of the nipāta and तदनुकूलव्यापार or action leading to it is that of the root.

Though साक्षात्कार is the meaning of the nipāta साक्षात्, it comes before the root कृ in the passive sense. In the definition of a transitive verb, there is no rule that the result should be the sense of the root only. It may be either of the root or of the nipāta with which the root is used. Hence the comparison उपास्यते हरिहरौ and the compared namely साक्षात्क्रियते etc. do not help to prove the point. In these examples the root has qualified sense. Hence nipatas are not manifestors.

K.Bh. counters the above argument. If nipātas become expressive, then in साक्षाक्रियते शिवः, the meaning perception etc. will be considered as namely nāmārtha or the sense of a noun. Then according to the maxim 'नामार्थधात्वर्थयोः भेदेन साक्षात् अन्वयः अव्युत्पन्नः' - 'there is no mutual agreement by differentiated relation between the sense of a noun and of a root. Similarly, there is no direct agreement between the senses of a nipāta and of a root. For such an agreement there is the need for case affixes like dvītiya etc. which show the differentiated relation etc.

Otherwise instead of तण्डुलं पचति, even तण्डुलः पचति should be accepted.

Further, anticipating the answer from the NKs that the maxim नामार्थ ... etc is not applicable to nipātas as the adjective निपातातिरिक्त - other than nipātas, is included, he explains further as moreover (किञ्च) etc.

If प्र etc become expressive, then प्र and निस् with the expressed meanings प्रकर्ष and निश्चय could be used independently. This leads to wrong usages. Whereas, with the grammarians this fault does not arise as they cannot be used independently.

K.Bh. shows other faults in the example - शोभनः समुच्चयो द्रष्टव्यः - 'a collection of good events'. Instead of this, it could be शोभनश्च द्रष्टव्यः - 'also good....'. In the example राजापुरुषः, - 'the king is a man,' it could be राज्ञः पुरुषः , if there is no need for case affixes for agreement by differentiated relation.

In धवखदिरयोः समुच्चयः the genitive in धवखदिरयोः has come because of its relation with समुच्चयः;. If the nipāta च becomes expressive then the usage धवस्य च खदिरस्य च will come instead of धवश्च and खदिरश्च which are in usage.

If nipātas become expressive, then they are treated as nominal stems. In that case they need case affixes like genitive etc. as there is no concordance by differentiated relation between two nominal stems, without case affixes.

With the grammarians, the word शोभन itself conveys the collective sense and hence there is no relation of subject and adjective relation between शोभन and च. Even in धवश्च there are no two nominal stems. Hence the fault does not arise.

ननु... नैयायिकाः - Objection - In the cognition of agreement through differentiation in the meanings of two nominal stems, the cause is the knowledge coming from two different case affixes (प्रातिपदिकार्थयोः भेदान्वयबोधे विरुद्ध विभक्ति जन्य उपस्थितिः हेतुः) - thus the cause effect notion mentioned above is a subject beyond the purview of nipātas. Hence the above fault does not exist.

Reply - One entity or a पदार्थ concords with an other similar entity and never with a dis-similar entity. But when the rule has restrained to an entity other than nipātas, where is the proof for applying the rule to nipātas ?

सदृश means - 'with a similar word standing in apposition'. The meaning 'concords by non-differentiation' is understood. विभागेन means 'with a dis-similar entity,' that is 'not standing in apposition'.

This is the meaning - 'the derivation that non-differentiated agreement between the meanings of two nominal bases standing in apposition is beyond the scope of nipātas'. Thus there is lack of proof and prolixity in this imagination.

Now. K.Bh. shows proof in applying this to nipātas also - अत एव means as the adjective nipātātirikta is not there, in usages like घटो नास्ति, the NKs give the meaning घटप्रतियोगिक - 'the counter positive being ghaṭa' for the word घट by lakṣaṇā or secondary means. Thus the NKs have accepted the non-differentiated agreement as '‘घटप्रतियोगिक अभिन्नः अभावः’, As per the NKs if it was beyond the scope of nipātas then the agreement in the negation, the sense of नञ् should have been shown by प्रतियोगिता निरूपकत्व भेदसम्बन्धे or the relation by the differentiation in the property due to counter positiveness. Thus their effort in taking resort to लक्षणा would become futile.

Now K.Bh. anticipates the following objection from the NKs- If import is shown in the sense of समुच्चय for infinite number of nouns, it leads to prolixity. Hence it is proper to accept a few nipātas as expressive.

Reply - If particles become expressive, there will be no concordance in poetry etc. K.Bh. illustrates with an example from Raghuvamsa. शरैरूस्रैरिवोदीच्यान् उद्धरिष्यन् रसानिव (रघुवंशम्). Here उस्रसदृशशर means, 'arrows similar to the rays'. But for उस्र it is उस्रसदृश and here if the word इव becomes द्योतक, a manifestor it looks appropriate. If without giving the meaning उस्रसदृश for उस्र, if इव becomes expressive of the sense of 'similarity', then the word उस्र concords with 'similarity' only and there will be no concordance with the instrumental case after the word उस्र. There is also violation of the rule that a प्रत्यय is that which agrees with the meaning of प्रकृति and conveys स्वार्थ (its own meaning).

By तथाहि he explains the same - उस्रैः is करणे तृतीया, but उस्र is not करण in the action of the upliftment of the kings of the north. उस्रसदृश is करण (instrument). Though the sense of इव in सदृश is the करण in the argument that, इवार्थ is सदृश, as it is not the meaning of the word उस्र, which is the base for the third case, it is not possible to convey the sense of similarity by the third case after the word उस्र. The third case will not set in after इव, which is असत्तार्थक and has no लिङ्गसंख्यान्वय. If the third case sets in, as इव is not असत्व, there is no निपात संज्ञा also, then it will not get the अव्ययसंज्ञा. If अव्ययसंज्ञा does not set in, then by the rule 'अव्ययात् आप् सुपः' (2.4.82), लुक् does not come for the affix सुप्. Then प्रत्यय too will have to be heard. Moreover, if the word इव becomes सदृशार्थवाचक, for उस्र पदार्थ by विषयतासम्बन्ध, then it concords with सादृश्य alone and hence does not agree with करणत्व the meaning of instrumental case in the word उस्र. Also, as the word उस्र is not instrumental even the third case will not set in after it.

For the word आदि in the kārikā, he gives an other example - वागर्थाविवसंपृक्तौ. Here as vāgartha concords with 'iva', the second case affix in वागर्थौ does not concord with vande. Moreover the object for vande becomes वागर्थसदृश. Then वागर्थसदृश not being the object does not get the second case affix. As similarity is not the meaning of the nominal stem, it cannot concord as the object for vande.

Or even if they say that the case affix after adjective is only for the purpose of having non-differentiated meaning or according to the maxim - न केवल प्रकृति प्रयोक्तव्या नापि केवलः प्रत्ययः - 'neither the stem nor the affix should be used alone.' Well, if it is meant to show the correctness of the word only, even then if इव becomes expressive there will not be either differentiated or non-differentiated concordance.

In उस्रैः इव शरैः there should be non-differentiated agreement according to the maxim समानाधिकरण प्रातिपदिकयोः अभेदेनैव अन्वयः - 'for nominal stems standing in apposition the concordance will be by non-differentiation only. But similarity is based on difference. As शर is not उस्र, there cannot be अभेदान्वय like उस्राभिन्नसदृशभिन्नः शरः'

उस्राभिन्नः सदृशः उस्र एव इति तस्य शरे, शरः, उस्रो न इति भेद सत्वात् अभेदान्वयोऽपि बाधितः तत्र इति भावः (प्रभा) . . If इव is a manifestor - the right cognition will be उस्र प्रतियोगिक सादृश्य विशिष्टाभिन्नः शरः. Now K.Bh anticipates an objection from the NKs - ननु त्वन्मते ... इति बोध्य - If particles become manifestors then in examples like

अब्राह्मणः etc. as nañ, the पूर्वपद is only a manifestor, has neither primary nor secondary meaning. Hence there is non-application of the definition of तत्पुरुष-उत्तर पदार्थ प्रधानः तत्पुरुषः - the sense of the latter word is important in तत्पुरुष.

Also, as upasargas don't have meaning independently, they will not get the sign of the nominal stem, as a result, no case affix also. Here उपसर्ग is only an example for all those, that are manifestors. The above objections is countered as follows -

It is not right to say that a word has sense when it is expressive only. A sense conveyed by any other means like lakṣaṇā, vyanjanā etc. also makes the word meaningful. Being a manifestor is as good as being suggestive. In this way, in a nañ-compound, the manifested sense of the particle (nipāta) becomes an adjective and the sense of the latter word becomes viśeṣya. In this way the nipātas get the sign of the nominal stem, as a result the case affixes also. Thus the definition of तत्पुरुष becomes applicable.

But K.Bh. writes that even if vyanjanā is not accepted the case-affixes come after nipātas by the indication of the sutra अव्ययादाप्सुपः as otherwise, the injunction of 'luk' for 'sup' goes futile. The characteristics of being a nominal stem will also set in from the vārtika निपातस्य चानर्थकस्य च or by the rule कृत्तद्धितसमासाश्च (1.2.46). Hence nipātas are manifestors.

Further K.Bh. supports his view by referring to the view of the MKs, that of the four kinds of words namely nāma, ākhyāta, upasarga and nipāta as doubt arises in the case of the meanings of noun and verb, they discuss and determine their meanings. But for upasargas and nipātas there are no primary or secondary means to convey any meaning. They only express the meanings along with the words with which they are stated - स्व समभिव्याहृत पदनिष्ठ शक्ति उद्बोधकत्वम् . Because, they are manifestors of sense, with a upasarga by force like - prāhara (beatings), āhāra (food), samhāra (to kill), vihāra (to sport) and parihara (compensation).

Thus, in this statement of elders, the word upasarga is an example of nipātas. The word root is to be understood as of the other word.

The NKs argue that - even if the nipāta is a manifestor, its power to express is not affected or set aside. Hence it is right to say that they are expressive.

K.Bh. expresses his disapproval for the above argument. If in the above manner, it is stated that in the word पचति etc. let the secondary sense i.e. 'action qualified by the agent be for the root itself and only the property of conveying the total sense be for तिङ् etc.' then that will not be approved. Hence he gives another view.

Thus, K.Bh. feels that for all upasargas and nipatas, the property of being either a manifestor or expressive can be proved. By agreement and difference, expressiveness can be proved. By reason of not using them independently, the property of being a manifestor can be proved. But K.Bh. disagrees with the NKs and writes that even the decision taken by the MKs and writes that even the decision taken by the MKs in समुच्चयाधिकरण that च etc. are expressive is not correct.

According to Nāgeśa, all upasargas are manifestors. But for some, depending on the context in which they are used, they can be वाचकs as well as द्योतकs. But some are only expressive. नञ् in the sense of negation is expressive. In nañ the imposed meaning is the manifested sense. But negation is the expressed sense.

Thus except Gārgya and the noe-MKs all grammarians agree to the property of being a manifestor to upasargas. Hence the kārikā is for dyotakatva.

But in the case of nipātas like nañ which is used independently and on the words of vākyapadīya (निपाताः द्योतकाः केचित् (II.192) it can be a manifestor. In this way, the cognition of agreement between root and nominal stem is by differentiation and not derived is beyond the purview of nipātas. It should also be accepted that nominal stems standing in apposition is by non-differentiation.

NKs argue that - to make the vārtika 'nipātasya anarthakasya' useful, it is right to accept some as वाचकs and some as द्योतकs.

This agreement does not stand. Because even then fault occurs as instead of stating प्र etc. are manifestors and च etc are expressive, the vice versa can also be stated. This fault cannot be avoided. To give the symbol of निपात for च, वा and other particles which have no meaning and are used only to make up the quarters in a verse, the vārtikas have been written. Moveover, by the presence of च in '‘कृत्तद्धित समासाश्च' itself, the meaning is understood, yet the vārtikās have been quoted again. Therefore it is not right to say केचित् द्योतकाः and केचित् वाचकाः

But, only by the word वृक्ष, the समुच्चयार्थ or collective sense is not revealed. समुच्चयार्थ is seen only after hearing the निपात च. Thus by अन्वयव्यतिरेक, च alone is the expression for समुच्चयार्थ. Moreover, if निपातs become manifestors, power has to be created in other words for that meaning. In च and others the power द्योतकत्व has to be created. Hence, even this argument is not suitable.

The fact that 'निपात's are तात्पर्यग्राहकs is conveyed by अन्वयव्यतिरेक. In the case of words like घट etc. the समुच्चयार्थ is got by लक्षणा. If च etc. are accepted as तात्पर्यग्राहकs like प्र-करण etc., there is no need to created two powers separately in घट and निपातs. For those who accept either द्योतकत्व or वाचकत्व. With समुच्चयार्थ realised by लक्षणा, then, regarding समुच्चयघटविषयकबोध, the cause is the cognition of लक्षणा present in the word घट. When समुच्चयार्थ is revealed by शक्ति then regarding समुच्चयघटविषयकबोध, the cause is the शक्ति or expressive power in the word धट. Thus both these cause - effect notions are necessary.

In these two theories of द्योतकत्व and वाचकत्व, more than giving the precise कार्यकारणभाव, as there is no need for more कार्य-कारणभावs there is no prolixity.

The argument that if particles become expressions, they make be used independently is also not correct.

According to the rule 'तेप्राक् धातोः' (p) 'प्र' etc. should be used before the verbal root only. Therefore there is no independent use for नञ् etc. Even though some become वाचकs due to शब्दशक्तिस्वभाव (natural power in a word), yet they should not be used. Though प्रत्ययs - suffixes are वाचकs they have to be used along with प्रकृतिs or bases. Therefore like शोभनः समुच्चयः, there is no usage like शोभनश्च. The निपातs being eternally dependant, convey the meaning as adjective to something else.

As the argument from both sides is equal - 'स वाचको विशेषाणां संभवात् द्योतको वा' these words from vākyapadiya appear to be appropriate. The other schools of philosophy which state that, प्र etc. are manifestors and च etc are expressive are also correct. To indicate this view in the kārika, it is said - 'मतमेवनः.....'. It is right to say that निपातs are वाचकs by अन्वयव्यतिरेक.

पर्यवसितं ..... द्रष्टव्यं - If upasargas प्र etc and nipātas च etc. are expressive, then their शक्ततावच्छेदक will be (उपसर्गत्व निपातत्व) which leads to गौरव. Hence, Dixita replies in the kārika निपातत्वं that - 'whatever others agree to be निपात, that will be निपात for grammarians also. This nipātatva is of four kinds - (1) असत्वार्थकत्वे सति चादिगण पठितत्वं । (2) शक्ति संबन्धेन निपातपदवत्वं । (3) जातिः and (4) उपाधिः

The first kind is got by the rule चादयो सत्त्वे (1.4.57). But if असत्वे becomes प्रसज्यप्रतिषेध, we may have to create two statements as चादयः - (1) च etc. get निपातसंज्ञा and (2) च etc. do no get निपातसंज्ञा, in the sense of सत्त्व. Similarly, for वाक्यभेद प्रतिषेधार्थक नञ् concords with action and as it does not concord with सत्वशब्द, there is असमर्थसमास and by निषेध there is शास्त्रबोध (objection by grammar). As these defects appear in असत्वे, one has to accept पर्युदास only. In that case च etc. which are असत्व get निपातसंज्ञा But च etc. will not get निपातसंज्ञा as they are used only for completing the पाद and are without meaning. For this purpose he has given another rule - 'शक्ति संबन्धेन निपात पदवत्वम्'. ईश्वरसंकेतः is शक्तिः, according to nyāya.

According to the doctrine of vaiyākaraṇas शक्ति is the अखण्डधर्मविशेष (one whole property), which is either बोधकता or बोधकतावच्छेदक. If that is so, then शक्यतावच्छेदक becomes पद. As words are infinite in number, it leads to गौरव. To avoid this, he gives a third alternative 'जातिर्वा'. प्रवृत्तिनिमित्त the cause for action being genus the शक्यतावच्छेदक becomes the निपातपद. निपातत्व is genus. Hence the defect that they are infinite does not arise.

Another view is निपातत्व is not जाति as it is associated with हत्व (ह) etc. In the हकार, present in the usage of धातु etc. there is हत्व but not निपातत्व. There is निपातत्व in च शब्द and not हत्व . Both निपातत्व and हत्व are present in ह.

Similarly निपातत्व is there in च-शब्द, where प्रत्व is not there. In विप्रशब्द there is निपातत्व and प्रत्व in प्र. Thus in प्र which is a निपात, in the same place, there is both प्रत्व and निपातत्व. This mixing up, affects जाति as per the statement व्यक्तेरभेदःतुल्यत्वं संकरोऽथानवस्थितिः - i.e. even mixing up of properties creates obstacles to the concept of genus. Therefore निापतत्व is not जाति or genus. If several nipātas like चत्व, प्रत्व etc. are accepted, it becomes prolix. Thus there is no proof in saying that निपातत्व is जाति.

Hence, K.Bh. gives the fourth alternative as '‘उपाधिर्वा' - नित्यत्वेसति अनेक संबंद्धत्वं i.e. being eternal, is present in many individuals is called उपाधि. That means, even if the शक्यतावच्छेदकभेद like चत्व, प्रत्व etc. exist, as they appear to be निपातs in one form, निपातत्व becomes जाति.

Only for वैषम्य or for the purpose of opposing, it is not right to say that the शक्यतावच्छेदक of the NKs, is प्रादित्व or उपसर्गत्व and the वाचकतावच्छेदक is चादित्व and निपातत्व . The maxim goes - 'सामान्यधर्मे प्रमाणानां पक्षपातः' - according to this rule, उपसर्गत्व is विशेष or व्याप्यधर्म. निपतत्व is सामान्य or व्यापकधर्म.

The proofs like द्योतकत्व, वाचकत्व and अवच्छेदकत्व have been the means to know the विधेयs in the form of द्योतकत्व, वाचकत्व etc. by निपातत्वरूपव्यापकधर्म. Let. शक्तता means वाचकता or द्योतकता Yet, it has to be created in the form of द्योतकता. The idea is explained as follows -

Due to the special property present in उपसर्गs, it is said to be either manifestors or expressive. In upasargas there are two kinds of properties namely उासर्गत्व and निापतत्व. Then which one has to be accepted ? When the doubt arises, then, as उवसर्गत्व is included in निापत. निपातत्व from the point of view of उपसर्गत्व is वयापक or more pervading. As निपातत्व is व्यापकधर्म, च etc. as वाचकत्व is shown in निपातत्व. Hence द्योतकत्व alone should be accepted. वाचकतावच्छेदक is निपातत्व and not उपसर्गत्व. Hence it is not prolix. In the Nyāya school while stating अदृष्ट as the sense, कार्यतावच्छेदक is कार्यत्व which is व्यापक and not घटत्व etc. Similarly, here also, it is proper to say either द्योतकत्व or वाचकत्व which has come down to us in usage. In this matter inference is the proof that निपाताः द्योतकाः निपातत्वात् उपसर्गवत् .

Though नञ् appears to be expressive due to the nature of natural import in words, yet it is not used independently. Even the suffixes, though expressive are always used with bases. Moreover like शोभनः समुच्चयः there is no usage as शोभनश्च. Particles being always dependent convey the meanings as adjectives to other words. Thus both वाचकत्व and द्योतकत्व can be equally argued for. They are expressive of some distinction in the action and also manifestors with relation to roots. Even though निपात is word, it is not used independently. च etc. are always dependent even though they denote the collected. (समुच्चित).

According to MKs and NKs some are manifestors and some others are expressive. K.Bh. shows clearly his acceptance of their views and says मतमेव नः

End of the Chapter in nipātārtha

अथ त्वादिभावप्रत्ययार्थनिर्णयः

The meaning of the suffix tva etc.

भावप्रत्ययार्थमाह ...... इति दिक् ..... Having explained नामार्थ and निपातार्थ, the नामविशेषs, now Kaunḍa Bhaṭṭa takes up the त्वादि तद्धितभाव pratyayās derived from nouns. The word भाव is derived as - भवन्ति-अर्थ बोधनाय प्रवर्तन्ते अनेन इति भावः, प्रकृति जन्य बोधे प्रकारी भूतः भावः । Bhāva is an adjective in the meaning of the प्रकृति or base. प्रकार means the substratum for विषयता. It is of two kinds as प्रकारता and संसर्गता. Example for प्रकारता is घनत्व. Ex. संसर्गता is औपगवत्व, राजपुरुषत्व, पाचकत्व etc. for Here, by the suffix 'त्व' the cognition by the property of association (संसर्गता) is 'जन्य-जनक भाव', स्वस्वामिभाव and क्रिया-कारक भाव respectively. According to the doctrine of grammarians, संसर्ग etc. are conveyed by the power of unitary meaning in vṛttis in general. Bhartṛhari in his commentary on the M.Bhāṣya states about the meaning of भावप्रत्ययs like त्व, तल् etc. coming after samāsas, तद्धितान्तs and कृदन्तs. कृत्तद्धित समासेभ्यः सम्बन्धाभिधानं भावप्रत्ययेन, अन्यत्र रूढि, अभिन्नरूप अव्यभिचरित संबन्धेभ्यः । The MKs think this wrongly as a vārtika. The idea here is the भापव्रत्यय after the compound राजपुरुषः conveys relation. The भावप्रत्ययs like त्व etc. after compounds, though express relation have three views as भेदः (difference) अराजकीय भिन्नः, संसर्गः (association) राजसंबन्धवान्; उभयं (both) अराजकीयभिन्नः, राजसंबन्धवान्.

In the view that the meaning of the compound is 'difference' like अराजकीय भेदवान्, by the word राजपुरुष, as the association of the king with पुरुष is not seen, relation also is not conveyed. When only the sense of भेद or difference is seen, भेद itself is the meaning of the suffx 'त्व'. Therefore, the statement that the भावप्रत्ययs after kridanta etc. convey the sense of relation is only to convey one of the views and not a doctrine.

By राजपुरुषत्वम् - the sense राजपुरुषनिष्ठ स्वस्वामिभाव संबन्धः, by औपगवत्वं the sense - उपगु अपत्यनिष्ठः अपत्यापत्यवत् सम्बन्धः and by पक्तृत्वं the sense पाक कर्तृ निष्ठः क्रिया कारक भावः संबन्धः' is conveyed. The भावप्रत्ययs in each is expressive of the respective relation.

अव्यभिचरित संबन्ध (uninterrupted relation) is the relation from birth to death of an individual. In औपगव etc. the relation of the notion of जन्य-जनक is continuous. Hence औपगवत्व means 'उपगु अपत्यत्व' only. The तद्धितान्त with other meanings would be examples for showing interrupted relation, ex. इन्द्रो देवता अस्य हविषः - ऐन्द्रं हविः.

If the भावप्रत्यय 'त्व' (which is देवतार्थक तद्धित प्रत्यय) sets in after the word इन्द्र, the form would be ऐन्द्रत्वं. The cognition would be - इन्द्राभिन्न देवतासंबन्ध. Here the relation of the act of charity fixed in Indra happens after the offering of the oblation.

Earlier to that, such a relation does not exist. Therefore this is called व्यभिचरित सम्बन्ध interrupted relation. That's why Bhartṛhari has stated अन्यत्र in his commentary. In places other than रूढि, अभिन्नरूप, and अव्यभिचरित संबन्ध, the भावप्रत्ययs convey relation, is his idea.

(1) As दामेदरत्व and कृष्णसर्पत्व have cognition related to genus,

they are रूढशब्दs. Without the need for the meanings of the parts if cognition is there by unitary power, then it is called '‘रूढ’. दामोदर means Viṣṇu and कृष्णसर्प means a kind of snake. There is no meaning in the parts. Here the affix 'त्व' shows genus. Similarly in तद्धितान्त words like खरहस्ति, कुञ्जर etc. and the compounds like सप्तपर्ण, लोहिताश्व etc. and the kṛdantas like गृह, रजक etc. are all रूढशब्दs. The suffixes त्वादि have set in after them in the sense of genus and not in the sense of relation.

(2) If after the तद्धितान्तs like शुक्ल etc. with the आनुपूर्वि similar to it, the तद्धित suffix मतुप् sets in, then लुक् (elision) takes place by the vārtika - गुणवचनेभ्यो मतुपो लुगिष्टः (1.4.19) and even the sense of 'गुण' and 'गुणसहित' have the same आनुपूर्वि 'शुक्ल' which is of the same form. The purpose of the suffix मतुप् is the expression for quality in 'पटस्य शुक्लः' and the expression for cloth (गुणि) in 'शुक्लः पटः'. Therefore after the तद्धितान्त words like शुक्ल etc as identity is seen in घटः शुक्लः, the भावप्रत्यय comes in the sense of the adjective 'गुण'. It will not set, in the intimate relation between गुण-गुणीत्व etc. coming in the sense of genus after the गुणवाचक word शुक्ल as in 'शुक्लो गुणः'.

(3) For uninterrupted relation, सत्ता is the example in 'सतोभावः'. The सत् object never gives up the relation सत्ता. Though अव्यभिचरितसत्ता relation exists in सद्वस्तु, and as it is seen wanting genus of the form सत्ता, the तल् affix sets in genus only. After establishing the relation of the king in the पुरुष, as the word राजा is used with the intention of gaining relation with the king, the

suffixes त्व etc. come in the sense of relation. After द्वन्द्व compounds 'त्व' etc. come in the sense of जातिसमुदाय (the group of one genus). Therefore the vārtika - '‘सिद्धन्तु यस्य गुणस्य भावात् द्रव्ये शब्दनिवेशः तदभिधाने’ त्वनलौ, under the rule 'तस्य भावः त्वनलौ' (5.1.119) and the bhāṣya - ‘यस्य गुणस्य भावात् द्रव्ये शब्दनिवेशः तदभिधाने तस्मिन् गुणी वक्तव्ये, प्रत्ययेन भवितव्यं’ and the statement of Kaiyaṭa - ‘गुण शब्देन यावान् कश्चित् पदाश्रयः भेदकः जात्यादिः अर्थः सः सर्वः इह गृह्यते’ - become relevant.

The meaning of the word दिक् by K.Bh. is, the intention with which a word is used becomes the cause for pravrtti. That alone is the meaning of the भावप्रत्ययs 'त्व' etc. This प्रवृत्तिनिमित्त will be genus, quality, relation, substance and negation in different places. The following are the respective examples. घटत्वम् (जातिः), शुक्लत्वम् (गुण), राजपुरुषत्वम् (संबन्धः), दण्डकत्वम् (द्रव्यम्) घटाभाववत्त्वम् (अभावः)

दण्डी इत्यादौ .... - In words like दण्डी, ending with मत्वर्थीय suffixes, the sense of ‘मतुप्’ is 'a puruṣa with the sense of the base दण्ड'. The relation between दण्ड and पुरुष is not the meaning of 'मतुप्'. The relation is seen in the sentence as तात्पर्यार्थ after the cognition of विशेष्य-विशेषण भाव. The relation is not known by words. Hence, in kṛdantas like पाचकः etc. the sense of 'कृत्' is 'क्रिया विशिष्ट कर्तृ'. Relation is seen later, thus say those who think that they are MKs. This is refuted by the kārika 'अर्धजरतीयं ....' जरत्याः अर्धं - अर्ध जरती, अर्धजरत्याः सदृशं- अर्धजरतीयं. The suffix 'घ' has set in, in the sense of इव by the rule - समासश्च (5.3.106) i.e. 'Let the front half of the hen be used for cooking and let the rear half be for laying eggs'. Thus to accept two jobs in one place is not possible.

The view of the MKs that some भावप्रत्ययs express relation and some others express substance becomes अर्धजरतीय. As the MKs do not state relation in दामोदरत्वं, घटत्वं etc. relation will not be conveyed even in usages like दण्डित्वं etc. If the adjective प्रकृतिजन्य बोधे प्रकारः is not included in घटत्व etc. then, even the dravya present in the base has to be conveyed by the भाव-प्रत्यय. But द्रव्यार्थ is not the adjective (प्रकार). In दण्डी etc. relation is not the adjective according to MKs. दण्ड alone is the adjective by the relation of conjunction. Then according to grammarians, if दण्ड is the प्रकार, as it does not exist in the प्रकृत्यर्थ by intimate relation and then, as it is not भाव the suffixes त्व etc. do not set in.

But the MKs say, that in the above mentioned cases 'स्व (प्रकृत्यर्थ) समवेत सम्बन्ध' - 'conjunction' and in that very sense the suffixes त्व etc. set in. In दण्डित्वं etc. as there is no intimate relation between दण्ड and पुरुष, the meaning of त्वप्रत्यय is not दण्ड. It is relation only.

But this is not correct. Though 'इनि' etc. having the sense of मतुप् are stated in the sense of relation, by the सामानाधिकरण्य in दण्डीपुरुषः etc. इनि etc become expressions of relation. Therefore, the सामानाधिकरण्य in दण्डीपुरुषः etc. इनि etc. become expressions of relation. Therefore, दण्डी being संबन्धविशिष्ट-वाचक, there is no problem in 'relation' being the meaning of the भावप्रत्यय. This topic has been dealt with in detail in वैय्याकरणभूषण.

In the श्रुतिवाक्य - 'सप्ते पयसि दधि आनयति सा वैश्वदेवी अमिका वाजिभ्यो वाजिनं' - as the तद्धित in वैश्वदेवी has the sense of 'relation', and as

वैश्वदेवी and अमिका have similar meanings there exists श्रौतसम्वन्ध due to तद्धित. Thus it is necessary to give the property of expressing relation (सम्बन्धि वाचकत्व) to तद्धितs.

Objections - Even according to grammarians some भावप्रत्ययs express genus etc. and others relation etc. How is this explained? Here, in the cognition of the power in प्रकृति, whether the adjective (प्रकार) is genus etc. or relation etc. or even both are all conveyed by the suffixes त्व etc. If this rule is accepted then there is no above वैषम्य. But there are two views in the theory - 'प्रकृतिजन्यबोधे प्रकारः' This is explained in the next kārikā.

तौ पक्षौ आह ... द्रष्टव्यं - The suffixes त्व etc. set in the after the base (प्रकृति), on the basis of the property, seen as adjective in the sense of the प्रकृति. That sense becomes the cause, and that itself is the sense of the affixes त्व etc. When the word घट is used, on the basis of the genus घटत्व, then only घटत्व becomes genus. After गुणवाचक words like शुक्ल etc. the suffixes त्व etc. come in the sense of गुण (quality). In पाचकः etc. as action is revealed as adjective, kriyā is conveyed prominently in पाचकत्वं etc.

Objection - In घटत्वं as घटत्वत्व is the adjective or the special property of घटत्व, the त्व-प्रत्यय after घट has to convey the meaning घटत्वत्व. But it being prolix, is not proper to become शक्यवावच्छेदक.

Reply - This cognition is welcome only. With this in view only the word 'धर्ममात्रं' is included in the kārikā. The भावप्रत्यय conveys the general property. Therefore the question of लघु-गुरु

does not rise here. It is only through this असाधारणधर्म, the knowledge of the adjective to the sense of प्रकृति is conveyed by भावप्रत्यय and not by the respective forms. Otherwise, infinite powers have to be created.

Actually there is no गौरव. घटत्व includes the individual घट, घटत्वत्व includes the घटत्वरूपव्यक्ति. In this way by the relation of स्ववृत्तित्व etc. vṛtti alone is the प्रकार. Therefore, the meaning of घटत्व-पटत्व ending in भावप्रत्ययs is genus of the form of ब्रह्मसत्ता. As that genus is अखण्ड, even if it conveys only the property, there is no गौरव. घटत्वत्वरूप is '‘तत्तत् व्यक्तिविशिष्ट ब्रह्मसत्ते ये घटत्व'. He quotes Harikārikās as a proof for this, which says - In गो etc genus is सत्ता which shows itself differently due to the condition (उपाधि) of the form of the individual. This is called ब्रह्मसत्ता. In this all words are expressive. They gain the प्रवृत्ति-निमित्त of the form of ब्रह्मसत्ता and convey their own meaning. The सत्ता present in each individual is called the प्रतिपादकार्थ and धात्वर्थ. The sense of the verbal root ‘पचूत्व’ etc. is genus only. This सत्ता is eternal i.e. ‘प्रागभावप्रतियोगि’, as it is the support for this world it is 'महान् आत्मा'. The भाव-प्रत्ययs त्व,तल् etc. indicate that ब्रह्मसत्ता.

The proof for some भावप्रत्ययs showing 'genus' and some 'relation' is the vārtika - ‘यस्य गुणस्य भावात् द्रव्ये शब्द निवेशः तदभिधाने त्वतलौ (वा) under the rule तस्य भावः त्वतलौ (5.1.119). Based on whatever adjective is used, in that very sense the suffixes त्व, तल etc. set in is the meaning of the vārtika. Thus the suffix त्व - etc. set in after रूप, रस etc. in the sense of genus, after शुक्ल, अणु, दीर्घ,

महत् etc. in the sense of quality, after पाचक etc. in the sense of action, after घट etc. in the sense of genus. The meaning of पाचक etc. is the association of क्रिया-कारक. Hence भावप्रत्तयs come in the sense of संसर्ग. There is no rule that the भावप्रत्यय comes in the sense of genus only. In घटत्व etc. as the relation of स्ववृत्तित्व exists, the vrttis become शक्यतावच्छेदकs. In घटत्वं - स्वेतर असमवेतत्व विशिष्ट निखिल स्वमसवेतत्व संबधेन) the special property may be indicated in the individual also. Therefore for घटत्वं, the cognition would be घटवृत्तिः असाधारणधर्मः.

पक्षान्तरमाह .... भूषणे - Under the rule तस्यभावः त्वतल् - he states an other view as - 'यद्वा सर्वे भावाः स्वेन अर्थेन भवन्ति, स तेषां भावः' According to this, the respective आनुपूर्विs become the meaning of भावप्रत्यय. यद्वा also indicates the vārtika, भवन्ति-वाचकत्वेन प्रवर्तन्ते इति भावाः कर्तरि ण-प्रत्यय has set in. As verbal roots have many meanings here the root भू means प्रवृत्ति. Thus भाव means शब्द or आनुपूर्वि. All words along with their expressed meaning become expressions (वाचकs) and the subject for usage. As word is used to gain meaning, in the use of word, meaning is the instrument.

Meaning is of two kinds as वाच्य and प्रवृत्ति-निमित्त. Of them वाच्य is द्रव्य or शब्द. The प्रवृत्तिनिमित्त should be understood by experience as genus in घट etc. kriyā in pāchaka etc., relation in राजपुरुष etc. and symbol in डित्य etc. As per the first view in घटत्व etc. if शक्यतावच्छेदक is the individual then in the second view word itself becomes शक्यतावच्छेदक. Therefore in this view गोत्व means 'गो शब्द प्रवृत्ति-निमित्त'.

Objection - Whatever is प्रकार becomes प्रवृत्ति-निमित्त. As शब्द is not seen like an adjective, it cannot be प्रवृत्ति-निमित्त.

Reply - अयं भावः A meaningful word like jāti etc. becomes adjective to dravya i.e. शक्यतावच्छेदक. By experience, it is well known in the world that words like Hari, Hara, Nala, Vasiṣṭha etc. lead to the cognition with word as adjective that somebody lived like that. Thus, even शब्द is the meaning of the suffixes 'त्व' etc.

If word is not seen as an adjective in its meaning, then there is no knowledge of the meaning of words listed in the वनौषधिवर्ग. In this way both genus etc. and शब्द are the अवच्छेदकs of power. Thus in भूषणसार it is explained in detail that even शब्द is the meaning of the suffix 'त्व'

End of the chapter on bhāva pratyayārtha.

अथ देवताप्रत्ययार्थ निर्णयः

The meaning of the taddita suffixes

सास्यदेवता (4.2.24) .... इति भावः - The suffixes 'त्व' etc. discussed in the last chapter being taddhitas, K.Bh. here debates over the meaning of taddhitas in the sense of 'devatā' etc. There are many views about the meaning of देवताप्रत्ययs

The rule 'सास्यदेवता' states that the अणादि प्रत्ययs come in the sense of genitive after the first case ending word देवता. For example ऐन्द्री, वैष्णदेवी etc. 'देवताविशिष्टदेयं'. In the oblation offered there is देवतावैशिष्ट्यं by the relation of स्वस्वामिभाव. Though एन्द्रि gives the sense of इन्द्रत्व, to get the meaning of the form of देवतात्व, it is necessary to give this meaning to the suffix, then the meaning would be इन्द्राभिन्ना देवतोद्देश्यकं हविः. The sense of तद्धित is 'देवता विशिष्टदेय' - is justified by the MKs in two kārikas. In 'सा वैश्वदेवी अमीक्षा' the taddhita suffix in वैश्वदेवी conveys the sense of देय, as the word अमीक्षा is in the proximity. देय in the form of अमीक्षा is the subject for charity. The देवता तद्धित after the word अग्नि is not capable of conveying the meaning सोमाधियुक्त अग्नि देवता संबन्धि or अन्ययुक्त अग्निदैवत्य.

The taddhita after dvandva compound conveys the sense of devatā present in the समुदाय (group). The word 'आग्नेय' gives the sense of oblation with Agni as the purpose. The sense - 'oblation referring to two Gods is not conveyed by the word 'आग्नेयं'. Hence, the चतुर्थीदानकरण ordained by the sentence 'आग्नेयं चतुर्थीकरोति' does not come in the अग्निष्ठोमीय oblation. By this discussion in the mimāmsā, it is clear that both देवता and देय are the meanings of तद्धित. This is further explained in the next kārikā by Dīxita that - when देवता विशिष्यदेय is the meaning of तद्धित then, in the एकदेश of देवता रूप the meaning of the प्रत्यय, the meaning of the प्रकृति namely Agni becomes the adjective.

According to the maxim - सामान्यविशेषयोः अभेदान्वयः the cognition would be 'अग्नि अभिन्न देवता संबन्धी हविः'. There is no agreement of the sense of अभेद संबन्ध with देवता, which is part of the meaning of the suffix even by अभेद संबन्ध. For this purpose, K.Bh. gives an other view - power should be accepted separately in देवता and देय for तद्धितप्रत्यय like 'एकवृन्तगतफलद्वय'. Power by देवतात्व in देवता and by संबन्धित्व in देय. Then the fault of एकदेश will not come.

ननु .... इति भावः - By the word Agñi, the sense of 'devatā' is not conveyed. But by लक्षणा the cognition of देवतार्थ comes. If उपसर्गs are manifestors in 'प्रजयति' by लक्षणा the sense of the root जी would be 'प्रकृष्टजय'. With the idea that even in the case of Agñi, Indra etc. the sense of devata is conveyed by लक्षणा, he states the next kārikā.

For Agñi etc. there is power only in the sense of प्रदेय. देवतार्थ is revealed by निरूढालक्षणा, which means - अनादि तात्पर्य विषयीभूत शक्ति समकक्ष्यापन्ना लक्षणा - निरूढ लक्षणा. In गाङ्गेयां घोषः there is a purpose for लक्षणा. In the case of शुक्लः, if लक्षणार्थ is given as शुक्लवान्, there is no use. This is निरूढा लक्षणा. The निरूढा लक्षणा does not need अनुपपत्ति or purpose. Thus there are many views like - (1)

देवताविशिष्टदेय प्रत्ययार्थ (2) देवता and देय प्रत्येक प्रत्ययार्थ (3) लक्षणा in the sense of देवता देयमात्र प्रत्ययार्थ (4) देवतात्व and देयप्रत्ययार्थ (5) देवता प्रकृत्यर्थ and देयद्रव्य is प्रत्ययार्थ etc. is stated in the śāstras.

Objection - In एन्द्रं दधि, the meaning of the base word Indra is इन्द्रदेवता. The meaning of the प्रत्यय is देयद्रव्य. संसर्ग is seen by ākāṅkṣa. The cognition will be इन्द्राभिन्नदेवता संबन्धि हविः. Here as the substance oblation etc. is conveyed by the word दधि itself, why should taddhita convey the sense of देय 'to be offered' once again ?

Reply - Even without the word 'दधि', by hearing only the word एन्द्रं, the sense 'देवता संबन्धि देय' is conveyed. In एन्द्रं दधि there is agreement in general, hence the sense of 'देय' has to be given to taddhitas. If only the sense of relation is given, then by the maxim 'नामार्थयोः अभेदान्वयः' there is no concordance of the भेदसंबन्ध of the form of आश्रयता. But, in एन्द्रंदधि. the agreement due to सामानाधिकरण्य is well known. Therefore, power for taddhita is in the sense of relation.

It is not right to say that this purpose can be achieved by लक्षणा.

The MKs have accepted the meaning 'देवता विशिष्टदेय' for the taddhita in the sense of devatā. Let them also give only the sense of devatā to taddhitas. Because, according to them, though genus is the meaning of pot etc. in शाब्दबोध, the individual is conveyed by आक्षेप. Similarly let there be only the sense of devatā taddhita. Let the substratum be conveyed by आक्षेप or प्रकृति.

Well, the sense of भावना to आख्यात is conveyed by power.

The agent as आश्रय is seen by आक्षेप. Let it be so in the case of taddhita also. But this contradicts their own statement - 'अमीक्षां देवतायुक्तां वदत्येव एष तद्धितः' When the sense of देवता is conveyed in Agñi etc by power only, why think of निरूढा लक्षणा ? Though the form of Agñi is conveyed by the word Agni, there is no power in the sense of देवता ? Hence to get the meaning 'अग्निभिन्नदेवता', लक्षणा is necessary. For this निरूढालक्षणा, the condition that there should be अनुपपत्ति is not required. But there should be well established usage (अनादिप्रयोग).

That's why in गङ्गायां घोषः, though there is the knowledge of अनुपपत्ति, as it is treated as अनादिप्रयोग, it is considered as निरूढालक्षणा.

अनयैव .... वस्तुत इति - When एकदेशान्वय of the sense of प्रकृति in taddhitas is taken, the meaning conveyed by power would be देवताविशिष्टदेय. If एकदेशान्वय is accepted, then, just as there are two separate powers in देवता and देय, power has to be accepted in other taddhitas also. The meaning of the rule तदस्यां प्रहरणमिति क्रीडायां णः (4.2.57) is 'तदस्यां क्रीडायां प्रहरणम्'. Here there is the meaning that after the first case ending word प्रहरण, the suffix 'ण' sets in. In examples like दाण्डा, मौष्टा etc, the meaning of the suffix 'ण' is 'प्रहरण विशिष्टा क्रीडा', or separate meaning like प्रहरण and क्रीडा or only the sense of क्रीडा - like this there are three views. Similarly, in the rule सोस्यनिवासः (4.3.89) the suffix अण् etc. sets in after the first case word in the sense of 'अस्य निवासः' But for the suffix अण् in examples like स्रौघ्न the meanings 'निवास विशिष्ट अधिकरण, and the senses 'निवास' and अधिकरण separately, and the sense 'संबन्धि' are there.

Similarly, the sūtras 'सास्मिन् पौर्णमासीति' (4.2.21) and 'तदस्य अस्ति अस्मिन् इति मतुप्' have to be explained.

The समर्थसूत्रभाष्य indicates that अतिरिक्तशक्ति has to be accepted in all vṛittis. Grammarians have accepted in the whole. Hence, the 'meaning for parts' given above is based on NK and MK views.

Objection - If अतिरिक्तशक्ति is accepted in vrttis in general then, the rules नपूजनात् (5.4.69), like सुराजा and तत्पुरुषः समानाधिकरणः कर्मधारयः (1.2.42) like महाप्रिया, पाचकस्त्री do not become relevant. As there are no parts in the vrtti, the usage like समानाधिकरणत्व and पूजनार्थत्व is not possible.

Reply - Though there is no real अवयवार्थ, by the imposed (आरोपित) अवयवार्थ and प्रकृति-प्रत्ययार्थ the above rules become relevant. Those who hold that sound is eternal, all divisions like अवयव, उपसर्ग, निपात, धातु and स्थानि, आदेश, their meanings are imaginary. In reality, the cognition of the meaning from power is in the whole. To convey this the word 'वस्तुतः' is inserted in the kārikā.

End of Chapter on devatā pratyayārtha.

अभेदैकत्वसंख्या निर्णयः

About Numbers

वृत्तिप्रसंगात् .... स्यादिति ध्येयं - Having discussed about the meaning of vrtti, now K.Bh. explains with examples how 'अभेद एकत्व संख्या' is conveyed in vṛtti. By the second case plural of कपिञ्जलान् in the vedic sentence 'कपिञ्जलान् अलभेत,' , just as त्रित्व is conveyed by the प्रत्यासत्तिन्याय, similarly, in vṛttis एकत्व and other numbers are conveyed in the form of संख्या and as एकत्व is the first of the numbers present, अभेदैकत्व संख्या (number having the property of non-differentiated singular) alone is seen. This is of two kinds as the first one is अभेदैकत्व संख्या. K.Bh quotes Hari Kārikā to explain this - Just as the essence of all herbs is seen in honey in the form of essence, in vṛttis also all numbers are revealed in the form of the number only. As there are no cases, the special features of numbers are not seen in their own form. Though there is mutual difference among the essence of herbs, they give up their own taste and show only as essence. This kind of unopposed revelation is called 'अभेदैकत्वसंख्या'

This view is not correct. As difference exists between dvitva and bahutva, they cannot be present in the same place. Hence, the bhāṣya states - 'न हि त्रिपुत्रः द्विपुत्र व्यपदेशं लभते'. As the combination of different herbal essences result in another rasa called honey, that example is not applicable.

Even a piece of cloth comprising parts of different colours becomes चित्र or many coloured piece of cloth. As many herbal essences have combined in honey, the result is it can cure many diseases. In vrttis though the special number exists there is no fruit. Therefore he gives another view.

The general number alone which has given up its special property is called 'अभेदैकत्व संख्या'. In this view the number in general is seen in the form of number, but not in the form of special property like one etc. Bhartrhari has his approval even for this view. Due to the absence of the knowledge (अपोह) of the adjective of the form of genus like एकत्व, द्वित्व etc. the nature of number is अभेदैकत्वसंख्या. Though pot etc. are white in colour, from a distance, only their form is realized. The special property that 'they are white in colour' is not seen. Similarly in vṛittis the sense of the adjectives have number is only realized but not visible in the form of the special properties ekatva, dvitva etc. This 'अभेदैकत्वंसख्या' is seen in vrttis like samāsa etc. This is in accordance with the doctrine of the grammarians and also the maxim - 'उपस्थितं परित्यज्य अनुपस्थित कल्पने मानाभावः'.

The number that is seen is by its form is explained as 'अयं भावः' After the cognition by the compound 'राजपुरुषः' the जिज्ञासा starts, whether it is 'राज्ञः, राज्ञोः, राज्ञं वा पुरुषः' knowledge in general is necessary as it leads to deep discussion. Without the knowledge that 'this is a Brahmin' the desire to know (जिज्ञासा), to which group of Brahmins he belongs to, will not rise. Similarly, after the cognition of राजपुरुषः the जिज्ञासा about singular number etc. starts. Hence, this knowledge of number in general, and also power for vrttis in this sense has to be accepted that, number just like the relation between earlier and later words, is the meaning of vrttis alone. In the case of द्विपुत्रः, मौद्गिकः, मासजातः, तावकीनः, भवद्गिरामवसरः,

कारकमध्ये etc. as number is revealed due to other reasons, even if 'अभेदएकत्वसंख्या' is not seen in the vṛitti, there is no defect. In द्विपुत्रः, by the word 'द्वि' the special number is seen. In मौद्गिकः as it is not possible to sell one 'black gram', the number 'many' as whole or one, (विशिष्ट ज्ञान), is seen. In तावकीनः, the number 'एकत्व' is seen by तावकादेश. In भवद्गिरामवसरः, the dual number is revealed by context. In कारकमध्ये as there is no middle for number 'one' dual is revelaed. In राजपुरुषः etc. when it is in a context, the number is revealed. Then it is not the meaning of vṛitti. It is dual etc. endowed with difference (भेद). The absence of dvitva etc. is ekatva. That is अभेदैकत्व.११ Hence, by the words 'एकवचनं उत्सर्गः करिष्यते' - there is the use of singular number in the alaukika vigraha vākya - राजन् + जस् - पुरुष + सु' Where the special numbers are revealed by context, there plural numbers also come like - चित्रगु - चित्र + अस् - गो + अस्. With respect to एकत्व seen in the meaning of the उपसर्जनपद in the vrttis, there is the support from 'कपिञ्जलाधिकरण न्याय'. In the vedic sentence - 'कपिञ्जला नालभेत' though there is plural number in कपिञ्जलान् as त्रित्व or three, is the first number among plural numbers, त्रित्व has seen decided as its meaning. Similarly, as एकत्व is first among numbers, it has to be accepted. In the rule - णिजां त्रयाणां गुणः श्लौ' (7.4.75), even if the word त्रयाणां is not there, by the 'कपिञ्जलाधिकरणन्याय', by the word 'णिजाम्' in plural number, त्रित्व is revealed and hence the use of 'त्रयाणां' becomes useless and hence the 'कपिञ्जलाधिकरणन्याय' will not be accepted by Grammarians. Then in the form of number, there is no possibility of the cognition एकत्व.

Actually, after the cognition of राजपुरुषः there is no जिज्ञासा in the पूर्वपदार्थ like (राज्ञाः राज्ञोः राज्ञां) as such an experience is not there. Thus it is not right to imagine about things which do not exist. The source for the statement that 'अभेदैकत्वंसंख्या' is seen in vrttis is from earlier works.

Even if, the जिज्ञासा, like राज्ञः राज्ञोः, राज्ञां is established, as the cause-effect notion of similar nature is present for ज्ञान and इच्छा, number in their special from as ekatva, dvitva etc. become the meaning of vṛittis - 'यद्धर्मप्रकारिका इच्छा तां प्रति तद्धर्मप्रकारकज्ञानस्यैव कारणता' being the well known statement, there wont be any cognition of either संख्यासामान्य or संख्याविशेष in the vṛittis. It is well known that in द्विपुरुषी etc. due to the special effort संख्या is revealed.

End of chapter on abhedaikatvasankhyā.

अथ संख्याविवक्षानिर्णयः

Discussion about number

संख्या प्रसंगात् .... ग्रह एकत्व संग्रहः -

In the last chapter while explaining about अभेदैकत्वसंख्या,it was shown that in 'कपिञ्जलान् अलभेत', there was indication for the त्रित्वसंख्या. In this K.Bh. explains the लक्ष्य and अविवक्षा for numbers in उद्देश्य - विधेयs. Depending on the लक्ष्य, in some places there is indication for numbers present in उद्देश्य-विधेयs. The MKs say that there is विवक्षा for numbers present in उद्देश्यs and in विधेयs. There is no such fast rule for grammarians. Both विवक्षा and अविवक्षा depend on the लक्ष्य - the saying goes - लक्ष्यानुसारात् व्यवस्था, प्रयोगशरणाः वैय्याकरणाः. The word 'तन्त्र' in the kārikā means 'विवक्षा' and अतन्त्र means 'अविवक्षा'. While deciding about word meaning the proof is the usage by learneds (आप्तs). In the ज्योतिष्ठोम - sacrifice, there is a sentence - दशापवित्रेण ग्रहं सम्मार्ष्टि गृह्यते सोमादिः अनेन इति ग्रहः - means the special vessel filled with Soma juice, used in the sacrifice. सम्मार्ष्टि is the विधेय. ग्रह is उद्देश्य as it concords with सम्मार्जन the विधेय. As all the vessels used in the sacrifice have to be cleaned, there is no recognition for the singular number in ग्रहं. But the grammarians recgonise this. Hence in प्रत्ययविधि, for the word धातु in धातोः (3.1.91) there is intention for the adjective एकत्त्व. Even MKs accept this, is shown in the kārikā 'उत्पद्येत'. In case, there is no intention for ekatva in the sūtra धातोः,then after every root i.e. after the धातुसमुदाय like धा, नि, ध्या etc. if suffix sets in, then the dvandva compound

'धवखदिरौ छिन्दि' the meaning of the सुप् suffix औ, is karma. In this karma, just like धवखदिर becoming adjectives separately, the meanings of all verbal roots have to become adjectives in प्रत्ययार्थ. Kumārila Bhaṭṭa has thus confirmed in the 'शब्दान्तराधिकरण' of 'श्लोकवार्तिक'.

धातुसंज्ञा is given for every root like भू etc. But not for धातुसमुदाय. Therefore, as suffixes do not set in after धातुसमुदाय, there is no fault even if there is no intention for ekatva in the adhikāra sūtra 'धातोः'. If it is argued so, then he gives another example - In the rule ''आर्धधातुकस्य इड्वलादेः' (7.2.35) विवक्षा has to be stated for वलादित्व which is an adjective to आर्धधातुक. If वलादित्व becomes अविवक्षित, then इडागम has to set in, in usages like प्रदीव्य, अवश्यपाच्यं, अवश्य लाव्यं etc.

In the पश्वेकत्वाधिकरण - the sentence 'पशुना यजेत' has been explained. The word पशुना which is विधेय conveys a whole पशु with पशुत्व, पुंस्त्व and एकत्वविशिष्ट. As विवक्षा is there for पशुत्व and पुंसत्व, anything that is not an animal and छागी cannot become a part of the yāga. Similarly, as the intention is there for singular number (एकत्व) 'many animals' cannot be a part of the sacrifice. This is the doctrine established by the MKs under the topic of विधेयविशेषण. But the grammarians do not follow this rule. As explained earlier, in some places depending on the topic, there is intention for विधेयविशेषण and in some it is not there. If it is accepted as a rule, then in the rule 'रदाभ्यां ....' (8.2.42) in the विधेय 'नः' if एकत्व is taken, then the intended two 'न-कारs' cannot be applied.

This comes in the way of forms like भिन्नः, छिन्नः etc. If it is stated that, by the presence of 'च' in the rule 'रदाभ्यां' two sentences are created and two 'नकारs' are enjoined separately, then forms like भिन्न etc are possible. In that case, he states another fault. In the rule 'आद्गुणः', (6.1.97), the word 'गुण' the expression for विधेय is in singular. Hence if the विवक्षा is taken for singular, then in the place of the earlier and later letters (पूर्व-पर वर्णs), only one गुण letter sets in. In that case, the use of the word 'एकः', in the rule 'एकः पूर्वपदयोः' (6.1.84) will be for no purpose. Hence there is no rule that विवक्षा is there for singular only.

K.Bh. explains the meaning of the kārikā. According to the लक्ष्य both विवक्षा and अविवक्षा are intended. Hence it is not suitable for the grammarians to follow the MKs.

ननु विधेय ..... इति भावः - The preamble to the next kārika is, if the MK view is not accepted then, in usages like सुध्युपास्यः, मध्वरिः, etc. infinite number of य-कार and व-कारs have to substituted. Even in भिन्नः, many नकारs have to come. As the पूर्व-परस्थानिs are different, to specify that the substitutes need not be different, and that it should be 'one', the use of the word एकः in the rule - 'एकः पूर्वपरयोः' is required. Therefore it is wrong to say that the use of एकः will be without any purpose. With this in view, the kārikā - विधेये भेदकं ... is stated.

Even in it is accepted that there is intention for विशेषण in the विधेय, the rule of विवक्षा or अविवक्षा in the case of उद्देश्य cannot be accepted. In the examples - ग्राहं सम्मार्ष्टि, पशुना यजेत etc. the वाक्यभेद

etc. which support the rules of विवक्षा-अविवक्षा have no appṛoved authority. They are opposed to the doctrine of the Mahābhāṣya - आशीर्यन्ते प्रकाश्यन्ते सिद्धान्ताः यत्र सः आकरः. 'आकर' is the place from where the doctrines originate. Any thing opposed to this is 'अनाकर' Therefore as in ''ग्रह एकत्व' there is no अविवक्षा for एकत्व in 'धातोः' and for वलादित्व in the sūtra 'आर्धधातुकस्य इड्वलादेः'. विवक्षा is there. Hence, there are the suffixes तिङ् etc. after verbal roots in singular number and इडागम when there is वलादित्वविशिष्ट आर्धधातुकत्व.

नन्वेवं .... इत्यर्थः - If विवक्षा is accepted for विधेय-विशेषण then, for 'नः' in the rule 'रादाभ्यां ....' there is एकत्व in the विधेय and as there is विवक्षा for that, in भिन्नः two नकारs will not set in for तकार and दकार. Only one नकार has to be substituted. For this, he replies - As च-कार is used in the rule रादाभ्यां .... two sentences have to be formed. नकार comes for तकार from the first sentence and for दकार in the धातु from the second sentence. Thus the form भिन्नः is formed. Therefore, there is nothing wrong even if विवक्षा is accepted in विधेयविशेषण.

End of Chapter on Sankhyāvivakṣā

अथ क्त्वाद्यर्थनिर्णयः

The meaning of the suffix ktvā etc.

क्त्वा प्रत्ययादेः .... इति कैयटः -

In the last chapter it was stated that there is विवक्षा for एकत्व in 'धातोः' or verbal root being the प्रकृति or base, this chapter states the meaning of प्रत्ययs namely क्त्वा etc by the kārikā 'अव्यय कृतः ....'

By the vārtika - 'अव्ययकृतोः भावे' (3.4.9) the suffixes तुमुन्, क्त्वा etc set in, the sense of the प्रकृति. The meaning 'समानकर्तृकत्व' etc are the manifested meanings of क्त्वा etc. and not the expressed meaning. The notion of क्त्वा etc. is action in 'साध्यावस्था'. This meaning comes from the root itself. The action which is the meaning of the base of the suffix क्त्वा becomes an adjective to another action.

'क्त्वा' etc grasp the total meaning सामानाधिकरण्य etc related to them. The property of manifesting (द्योतकत्व) is the same as the property of grasping (ग्राहकत्व) the total meaning. The NKs say that, these meanings are the expressed meanings of क्तवा etc. As, creating power (शक्ति) in many relations, leads to गौरव, the grammarians state that the meaning 'सामानाधिकरण्य' etc is got from आकांक्षा. Thus तुमुन्, क्त्वा etc are manifestors of the total meaning.

In fact, the use of the word 'तुमादयः' in the kārikā, in the context of fixing the meanings of क्त्वा etc. does not appear to be correct But, Patañjali in his Bhāṣya having stated 'तुमर्थोभावः', then in the rule which states about the suffix 'कृत्' etc. which get the indeclinable sign by the rule तुमर्थे... (3.4.9), draws the word तुमर्थे. As 'क्त्वा' etc. are coming in the sense of भावार्थ, he has rejected the vārtika - 'अव्यय कृतो भावे', to convey that, Dixita has stated तुमादयः instead of क्त्वादयः. Moreover, as more information had to be given about क्त्वा etc. the chapter is named as क्त्वाद्यर्थनिर्णयः.

If it is said that the suffixes क्त्वा etc. are only भावार्थ or the meanings of verbal roots, then there is opposition from the rule 'समानकर्तृकयोः पूर्वकाले' (3.4.21). For this purpose, he has stated in the latter half of the kārikā that क्त्वा etc. are manifestors of the meanings of कर्तृकादि. The word 'समान' in the rule means 'एक'. There is no विवक्षा or intention for the real number 'समान कर्तृकयोः' Therefore, the forms 'स्नात्वा, भुक्त्वा, पीत्वा, व्रजति' get established. This point is made clear in the Bhāṣya - 'नान्तरीयकत्वात् अत्र द्विवचनेन निर्देशः क्रियते, न हि अत्र निर्देशः तन्त्रम्'. (3.4.21)

Objection - In 'स्नात्वा, भुक्त्वा, पीत्वा व्रजति' the act of taking bath comes earlier. क्त्वा sets in after that. The act of भोजन and पान are in the middle and not earlier. Therefore the suffix क्त्वा does not set in the after them.

Reply - As विवक्षा is there for the पूर्वत्व of व्रजनक्रिया which is important, and as all activities स्नान, भोजन and पान are prior to going, क्त्वा sets in after everyone of them. The विवक्षा is not for ' earlier to all'.

"Amidst, many धात्वर्थs having a single agent, क्त्वा sets in after roots related to the पूर्वकाल' - is the meaning of the rule. For removing the आकांक्षा of the meaning, when there is a general rule कर्तरिकृत् (3.4.67), by stating the vārtikā 'अव्ययकृतो भावे' (वा), the समानकर्तृत्व etc seen in the शाब्दबोध are only manifestors and not expressive is made clear.

Really speaking, even if this meaning is द्योतक, for that purpose व्यञ्जनावृत्ति has to accepted. That leads to prolixity. Hence he states by association itself, 'समानकर्तृकत्व' etc are seen. After writing 'अंय भावः', K.Bh states - In usages like भोक्तुं पचति, भुक्त्वा पचति etc. the property of single sentence cannot be established for भोजन-पाक क्रिया without stating विशेष्य-विशेषण भाव, otherwise, even group of words like भुङ्क्ते व्रजति etc. have to become single sentences. Moreover, it is opposed to the vārtika 'समानवाक्ये निघात' (8.2.18) Thus, in भुक्त्वा व्रजति etc. when एकवाक्यत्व is ready for the actions भुजि and व्रजन, the संसर्ग which conveys विशेष्य-विशेषण भाव is of many kinds, like - जन्यत्व, सामानाधिकरण्य, पूर्वोत्तरभाव, व्यप्यत्व etc जन्यत्व means जन्यजनकभाव and that is also संसर्ग. From the sentence 'भोक्तुं पचति' by association, the property of being. 'जनक' is revealed. By the relation of जनकत्व, the cognition would be 'भोजन विशिष्टा पाकक्रिया'. By the vākya 'भुक्त्वा तृप्तः' जन्यत्व is revealed by the relation of संसर्ग, जन्यत्व being संसर्ग. When विवक्षा is given for भोजन जन्यत्व in तृप्ति, though 'drinking water' etc. exists later the usage 'पीत्वा तृप्तः' is not used. But if the तृप्ति is intended as पानजन्य, the usage 'पीत्वा तृप्तः' is approved.

सामानाधिकरण्य means having the same substratum. As सामानाधिकरण्य is also संसर्ग the property of having the same agent is also understood. When there are two different agents and two different actions, the usage 'भुक्त्वा तृप्तः' is not correct. In cases where different agents are not there, due to the absence of जन्य-जनक भाव, it need not be said that सामानाधिकरण्य is also संसर्ग.

'पूर्वोत्तरभाव' means the actions that take place earlier and later times. In 'भुक्तवा व्रजति' etc both समानाधिकरण्य and पूर्वोत्तरभाव are संसर्गs. Therefore, the cognition would be - 'भोजन सामानाधिकरणादुत्तर कालिकी व्रजन क्रिया'.

व्याप्यत्व means अविनाभावित्व or 'नियत साहचर्य' invariable concomitance. The examples for this are - अधीत्यतिष्ठति, मुखंव्यादाय स्वपिति etc. Here व्याप्यत्व and सामानाधिकरण्य are संसर्गs. In the examples, whenever there is 'स्थिति and स्वाप' then 'अध्ययन and मुखव्यादान' are also present. Hence स्थिति and स्वाप are व्याप्यs and 'अध्ययन and 'व्यादान' are व्यापकs. Thus the अवच्छेदक relation of व्याप्यता-व्यापकता is of the same type. Therefore here only व्याप्यत्व is not संसर्ग. Even सामानाधिकरण्य is संसर्ग. Like this, relation is seen by आकांक्षा. According to one school relation is 'आकांक्षालभ्य' and in another's view it is 'वाक्यार्थः संसर्गः'. But by the maxim 'अनन्यलभ्यो हि शब्दार्थः' prior and later are not confirmed by the sūtra. Hence the vārtika - 'अव्ययकृतो भावे' (वा) is relevant. Hence क्त्वा etc. are manifestors, being तात्पर्यग्राहकs in linking the actions of the क्त्वा प्रत्यय प्रकृति and the suffixes तिङ् etc. As क्त्वा etc. manifest the relation सामानाधिकरण्य etc. the Bhāṣya - 'स्वशब्देनोपात्तत्वात् न' under the rule 'समानकर्तृकयोः पूर्वकाले' (3.4.21) means - क्त्वा etc. set in when the पौर्वापर्यकाल is manifested. If the meaning becomes expressive by any word in the sentence then क्त्वा etc. do not set in by the maxim - 'उक्तार्थानां अप्रयोगः', thus Kaiyaṭa has made it clear in his commentary on the Bhāṣya. 'समान कर्तृकयोः' is used in the sense of 'निर्धारणे षष्ठी'. In पूर्वकालः there is bahuvrīhi like पूर्वः कालः यस्य सः. Then, क्त्वा sets in after roots giving the meaning of the earlier relation in the midst of धात्वर्थs having the same agent.' This is the meaning of the sūtra also. In पूर्वं भुक्त्वा, पश्चात् व्रजति' as the earlier time is specified by the word पूर्वं, how has क्तवा set in ? For this the Bhāṣya replies - 'न एतत् क्रिया पौर्वकाल्यं, किं तर्हि ? कर्तृ पौर्वकाल्यं एतत्, पूर्वं असौ भुक्त्वा, अन्येभ्यो भोक्तृभ्यः, ततः पश्चात् व्रजति अन्येभ्यः व्रजितृभ्यः'. As it means - 'having had his lunch earlier, leaves after everybody else has left' - the suffix क्त्वा sets in by the rule - 'विभाषाग्रे प्रथम पूर्वेषु' (3.4.34)

Objection - 'पूर्वकालः' is a कर्मधारय compound. The meaning of the rule is - 'In the midst of the meanings of dhātus having the same agent, क्त्वा sets in after the root having the sense along with पूर्वकाल'.

The पूर्वकाल which is the sense of क्त्वा is the adjective to धात्वर्थ. Hence, as it has the same agent, let क्त्वा set in, in the example - 'पूर्वं भुङ्क्ते, पश्चात् व्रजति'

The Bhāṣya has replied for this - 'स्वशब्देन उपात्तत्वात् न.' स्व means पूर्वशब्द. As it is indicated by the word पूर्व in the sentence, क्त्वा does not set in.

यत्तु .... विस्तरः - Some say - as bahurvrihi has come in both words - 'समानकर्तृकयोः पूर्वकाले' the property of having the same agent is manifested. There is no proof in the view that पूर्वकाल is expressive. Therefore, समानकर्तृकत्व is expressed by त्वा itself. If not, in the vākya - ओदनं पक्त्वा अहं भोक्ष्ये as the agent is not specified instead of अहं, the word मया has to be used. In 'अनभिहिते' (2.3.1), taking resort to the प्रसज्य प्रतिषेध like 'अभिहिते न', then by the tiṅ in भोक्ष्ये, the agent becomes specified and hence 'मया' will not set in.

Even then, as other defects like वाक्यभेद etc are seen, it is not right to take the help of प्रसज्यप्रतिषेध. Only पर्युदास has to be resorted to. As the नञ् in 'अनभिहिते' is of the sense of पर्युदास, in 'प्रासादे आस्ते', the Bhāṣya writes - सदि प्रत्ययेन अभिधानं, असिप्रत्ययेन अनभिधानं, यो अनभिधानं तदाश्रया सप्तमी भविष्यति - though the substratum of the act of prasādana is stated, the substratum of the असिक्रिया is not stead. Hence सप्तमी has set in as प्रासादे.

In आदेनं पक्त्वा अहं भोक्ष्ये - there are two acts like भोजन-पाक. The agent of भोजन क्रिया is revealed by tiṅ, but the agent of पाकक्रिया is not specified by anything, hence तृतीया (मया) has to come. Therefore त्वा is expressive of the agent and not a द्योतक.

Reply - The sūtra does not give the sense that - 'समानकर्तृकत्व is the expressed meaning of the suffix क्त्वा'. If that was the intention of Pāṇini, like the rule कर्तरिकृत् (3.4.87), he would have stated - 'समानकर्तरि पूर्वकाले'.

In the sentence - ओदनं पक्त्वा अहं भोक्ष्ये - there are two actions namely पाक and भोजन. The meaning of tiṅ i.e. भोक्ष्ये is prominent, the act of पाक is adjective to it. Hence it is secondary (अप्रधान) . According to maxim प्रधानानुबोधेन गुणी कार्यप्रवृत्तिः - as the गुण follows the प्रधान, though the secondary पाकक्रिया is not specified, it has to be taken as specified. Hence मया will not come. This is made clear in the Bhāṣya, under the rule - स्वादुमिणमुल् (3.4.26). Even Bhartṛhari has explained this in two kārikās.

This is just an example - when the prominent power is unspecified, the power indicated by गुणक्रिया, though specified, is as good as unspecified. Like 'प्रासादे शेते' - Here, प्रसदन क्रियाधिकरण is secondary, but it is specified. The important शयनक्रियाधिकरण is अनुक्त. Hence, सप्तमी has set in as प्रासादे.

Moreover - if the maxim - 'प्रधानानुबोधेन गुणी कार्यप्रवृत्तिः' is not considered then just as it is said that the meaning of क्त्वा is agent, even कर्म has to become the meaning of क्त्वा. That leads to prolixity. There is no proof also for that. Then in 'पक्त्वा ओदनः मया भुज्यते' as the पाकक्रियाकर्म is not specified, it is not possible to check the second case after the word 'ओदन'. By the above maxim, कर्म is specified by the tiṅanta भुज्यते, then imagining that the कर्म of the अप्रधान-पाकक्रिया is also specified, the second case does not come after ओदन.

Where ever there is one प्रधानक्रिया and many अप्रधानक्रियाs there, all पूर्वकालिक क्रिया s become adjectives to the प्रधानक्रिया and thus concord. According to the maxim - 'गुणानां च परार्थत्वात् असंबन्धः समत्वात्' - there is no concordance between अप्रधानक्रियाs. Therefore, the order may be changed as भुक्त्वा, स्नात्वा, पीत्वा गतः or स्नात्वा, पीत्वा, भुक्तवा गतः'.

End of the Chapter on ktvādyartha.

अथ स्फोट निरूपणम्

Discussion on the doctrine of Sphoṭa

There are two theories about शब्द. The NK and the VK schools of philosophy consider शब्द as 'अनित्य' transitory - आदिमत्वादैन्द्रियकत्वात् कृतकवदुपचाराश्च (2.2.13) is the sūtra by Gautama, the founder of the Nyāya school. In this sūtra, he has given three reasons to show that शब्द is अनित्य. Vātsyāyaṇa the writer of nyāyabhāṣya states that -

(1) 'आदिमत्वात्' - आदि-कारणं, कारणवत् अनित्यं as conjunction and disjunction are the causes for शब्द, it is अनित्य.

(2) ऐन्द्रियकत्वात् - शब्द is grasped by the sense organ 'ear'. Hence it is 'अनित्य' like 'रूप' etc which are also grasped by sense organs.

(3) कृतकवदुपचाराश्च - Just like the usage - तीव्रं सुखं, मन्दं सुखं, तीव्रं दुःखं, मन्दं दुःखं there is the usage तीव्रः शब्दः, मन्दः शब्दः etc. Hence it is अनित्य.

Thus, in the nyāyadarṣana the order of the origin and destruction of letters have been described as follows -The letter originates in the first moment. It exists in the second moment. In that very moment the second varṇa is created. In the third moment the first letter gets destroyed like this created शब्द reaches the ear of the listener. This production of sound continues till the force of the wind is there and then stops.

Even the vaiśeṣikas consider शब्द as अनित्य - The first vaiśeṣika sūtra reads - गुणस्य सतो अपवर्गः कर्मभिः साधर्म्य (2.2.25). Due to the similarity with transitory action even शब्द is अनित्य. सतो लिङ्गाभावात् - there is no proof to show that शब्द is eternal. Hence शब्द is अनित्य.

The MKs, Vedāntins, Sānkhyas and Yoga school consider शब्द as नित्य.

सिद्धान्त निष्कर्षमाह ... स्वादयश्च इत्यर्थः - Now K refutes the views of the NKs and MKs, and presents the doctrine of the grammarians. The NKs do not accept power in the sentence. पद is शक्त. पदसमुदाय - group of words is a sentence. शाब्दबोध takes place by आकांक्षा etc. Therefore, there is no अतिरिक्तशक्ति in a vākya. This is the view of the NKs.

Even the MKs' do not accept power in a sentence. They state लक्षणा for a sentence in संसर्ग or association. As there is no power in a sentence, and शक्यसम्बन्धरूप लक्षणा being impossible - they state ज्ञाप्यसम्बन्धरूपलक्षणा. As the meaning of a sentence is वाक्यज्ञाप्य, वाक्यस्य लक्षणा is right. Therefore, for गभीरायां नद्यां घोषः - गभीराभिन्न नदी सम्बन्ध तीरे घोषः is the verbal cognition. According to the MKs it is - सर्वत्रैव हि वाक्यार्थो लक्ष्य एवेति च स्थितम्.

To refute the Nyāya and MK schools Dixita gives the Kārikā 'वाक्यस्फोटः' It is stated that -

उपायाः शिक्षमाणानां बालानां उपलालनाः ।
असत्ये वर्त्मनि स्थित्वा सत्यं समीहते ॥

The purpose of grammar is to establish the real vākya sphoṭa, which is शक्त. To convey that, the divisions like प्रकृति-प्रत्यय, their meanings etc are कल्पित, and not real, Dīxita states the kārikā

'वाक्यस्फोटः' etc. The word 'निष्कर्ष means प्रमाणैः निर्णीतः संक्षिप्तः अर्थः i.e. to provide the meanings established by valid proofs, briefly.

Sphoṭa is of eight kinds as - वर्ण, पद, वाक्य, वर्णजाति, पदजाति, वाक्यजाति, अखण्डपद and अखण्डवाक्य. There is no division like सखण्ड and अखण्ड in वर्णस्फोट. There is no meaning for the parts in प्रकृति-प्रत्यय. वर्णस्फोट is of the form of प्रकृति-प्रत्यय. Only those which convey meaning are referred to as अखण्ड-सखण्ड. The eight sphoṭas are as follows -

(1) वर्णस्फोट is that, where meaning is conveyed by the sphoṭa from the last letter of प्रकृति-प्रत्यय.

(2) पदस्फोट is that when the meaning is conveyed by the sphoṭa of the last letter of सुबन्त-तिङन्त.

(3) वाक्यस्फोट is that, when the meaning flashes from the last letter of a sentence, which is a group of subantas and tiṅantas.

(4) वर्णजाति स्फोट is that when the meaning is conveyed by the genus in the वर्ण.

(5) पदजातिस्फोट is that when the meaning flashes from the genus in the पद.

(6) वाक्यजातिस्फोट is that, when the meaning flashes from the genus in the sentence.

(7) अखण्ड पद स्फोट is that when the meaning flashes due to पदस्फोट i.e. without conveying separate meanings for प्रकृति and प्रत्रुय but conveying for the whole group.

(8) अखण्डवाक्यस्फोट is that when meaning flashes from the

entire sentence, without conveying separate sense for सुबन्त-तिङन्तs.

For those who do not have any knowledge of grammar, meaning flashes by the whole sentence only. This is called अखण्ड-स्फोट. Of these eight sphotas vākya sphoṭa is the most important. The rest help in the cognition of vākya sphoṭa.

Objection - Sphoṭa is that which flashes. Hence, there is opposition from the Bhāṣya that there is no cognition from sphoṭa, under the rule णुदि (1.1.69) 'उच्चार्यमाणः शब्दः संप्रत्यायको भवति, न संप्रतीयमानः'.

Reply - The meaning of 'न संप्रतीयमान' is what flashes without hearing is not cognition. Sphoṭa in the form of ध्वनि is fit to be grasped by the ear. Hence there is no opposition from the Bhāṣya.

The saying 'एकं पदं, एकं वाक्यं' is approved by all schools. But, as soon as letters are pronounced, they get destroyed. Hence there is no समूह and it is not expressive. The earlier letters leave their impression by experience and the last letter leads to cognition. Hence, there is no need for sphoṭa.

Reply - As the letters provided in an order, get destroyed and do not exist at the same time, they are not capable of leaving any impression. As there is no rule that they can be recalled in the same order, the cognition of नदी could be like दीन, सरः, could be रसः Then different meanings are conveyed.

Therefore, to prove the statement एकं पदं एकं वाक्यं, and to support vṛtti, sphota which is one and eternal has to be accepted. Sphoṭa flashes along with the property of dhvani. The word sphoṭa is used first in Pāṇini's sūtra 'अवङ् स्फोटायनस्य'.

सिद्धान्त निष्कर्ममाह ... स्वादयश्च इत्यर्थः - Having refuted the NK and MK views, K.Bh. now presents the doctrine of the grammarians.

Having stated the eight kinds of spoṭas first he explains वर्णस्फोट as - साधु शब्दे इति - Are the स्थानिs (सु, लट्) which are recalled by the प्रकृति-प्रत्ययs in the साधुशब्दs, expressive or not is the doubt. The sentence which is ambiguous is called 'विप्रतिपत्ति.' संशयाय यावत् कोटि उपस्थापकं वाक्यं- विप्रतिपत्तिः is the view of the दर्पणकार. विरुद्धा प्रतिपत्तिः-विप्रतिपत्तिः - 'परस्पर विरुद्धधर्म प्रकारकं एक धर्मिकं ज्ञानं. Gautama defines संशय in the rule - समानअनेकधर्मोपपत्तेः विप्रतिपत्तेः, उपलब्धि, अनुपलब्धि अव्यवस्थातश्च विशेषापेक्षो विमर्शः संशयः (२३). Then he has indicated that विप्रतिपत्ति is the cause for संशय. There are four reasons for संशय.

(1) समानानेकधर्मोपपत्तेः - By the knowledge of words having similar meanings like औन्नत्य, विस्तार etc. For ex. स्थाणुर्वा पुरुषो वा.

(2) विप्रतिपत्तेः - 'One object having contradicting properties like आत्मा विभुः वा, अणुः वा.

(3) उपलब्धि अव्यवस्थातः - उपलब्धि means knowledge. Any disorder in it also leads to doubt like सत् उपलभ्यते असत् वा.

(4) अनुपलब्ध्यवस्थातः - अनुपलब्धि means 'not gained' due to lack of rules, ambiguity arises - like किं सत् नोपलभ्यते उत असन्नपि.

The substitutes in साधुशब्दs are only reminders of स्थानिs and don't convey meaning. सु, लट् etc are अर्थप्रत्यायकाs is the view of NKs. The grammarians state that - The visarga, and ti etc in sādhu śabdas convey meaning. The suffixes सु etc created for derivational purpose do not convey any meaning. They give three reasons for this -

(1) स्थानिs are created. स्थानिs are different in different grammars. There is no rigid rule which says that these are स्थानिs. Hence they are not expressive.

(2) In रामः, by visarga रु is recalled. From that सकार is received. In बभूव, from णल्, the suffix तिप् is recalled, from that ल-कार is recalled - in this way it leads to prolixity.

(3) Even for those who do not know any grammar only by hearing the आदेश, there is cognition. Hence it cannot be said that स्थानिs lead to cognition.

विधिकोटि - means 'प्रकृतिभाव प्रतियोगि सत्ताबोधनम्' The words पक्ष and कोटि are synonyms. पक्ष is the opposite properties present in the same substratum. Like - अस्ति आत्मा, नास्ति आत्मा. The opposing properties present in different अधिकरणs is called प्रतिपक्ष. Like नित्य-आत्मा, अनित्या बुद्धिः etc.

The NKs think that the recalled Sthānis are expressive. But the grammarians are of the view that sthanis are not expressive. The आदेशs ति, विसर्ग etc seen in साधुशब्दs, convey meaning means they are expressive. बोधजनकत्व is शक्तत्व or वाचकत्व.

येतु ... प्रवर्तेत - The NKs give reasons to prove that Sthanis are expressive.

The आदेशs, सुप् तिङ् etc being many, it leads to गौरव. Hence ति, विसर्ग etc are not expressive in usage.

In examples like एधाञ्चक्रे, आनय, ब्रह्म, वारि, etc there is elision for substitutes. Hence it cannot lead to cognition. शाब्दबोध is based on the notion, that there is no cognition by negation.

Objection - By the maxim - 'यः शिष्यते स लुप्तमानार्थाभिधायी' - when there is elision, the meaning of the suffix is conveyed by the base (प्रकृति).

Reply - It is not proper to give power to the base for the meaning of the suffix.

According to grammarians - 'उच्चरितः शब्दः प्रत्यायकः, नानुच्चरितः' is the rule. In the case of ब्रह्म etc. as the आदेश is not heard, there will not be any cognition. Therefore the लकारs and svādis recalled by आदेशs are expressive. Moreover the 'लत्व' seen in all ल-कारs is genus. If that becomes शक्ततावच्छेदक it leads to brevity.

As there are many substituṭes there will be the fault of परस्परव्यभिचार. If there are many causes for one effect, and if the कार्य takes place by one cause, then as all the causes are not applicable or present it becomes व्यभिचार. There are many causes like तिप्, तस् etc. when the effect कृति is seen in the presence of तिप्, as तस् is not there, it leads to व्यभिचार and vice versa. Therefore आदेशs are not expressive.

Even Pāṇini has stated meaning for sthānis and not substitutes in his rule 'लः कर्मणि' (3.4.69). Therefore only sthānis are epxressive and not आदेशs.

To refuse this theory of the NKs. Dixita states the next kārikā 'व्यवस्थितेः......' etc.K.Bh. gives four reasons to show that substitutes are expressive.

(1) व्यवस्थितेः - व्यवस्था means the fixing or cognition of meaning based on valid proofs.

According to व्यवस्था the substitutes तिप् etc are expressive, not लकारs reminded by them. In usage पचति etc conveys meaning even for those who have no knowledge of the sthāni-lakāras. Hence they are not vācakas. It is not right to say that the cognition of lakāra as power in tiṅ etc is due to illusion. Because there is no proof for that. विषयता बाध is भ्रमा.

Again it is not right to say that if लत्व the genus becomes 'शक्ततावच्छेदक' it leads to लाघव. Because, in रामः, सु is the स्थानि for Pāṇini. In other grammars रु is the स्थानि. As grammarians have accepted different sthānis, it is difficult to settle which is शक्त and which is not. If all of them become शक्त, it leads to, both गौरव and व्यभिचार. As आदेशs are fixed in usage, it is right that substitutes have power.

(2) व्यवहृतेः - गौरव is not a fault in meanings acquired on valid proofs. For that purpose K.Bh gives the second reason.

संकेत is power according to NKs. According to MKs पदार्थान्तर is power. In this condition, it is right to depend on the rule 'लः कर्मणि'. To ward off the doubt that power like कर्तृ etc has to be given to lakāra, he gives the second reason.

व्यवहार or usage is the most important among शक्तिग्राहकs. As the knowledge of power is in ति etc. those which are heard, namely tiṅ etc are expressive.

तद्धेतुन्यायतः - The maxim is based on 'तद्धेतोरेव तत्त्वे किं तेन' -

which leads to brevity. If the स्थनिलकार becomes expressive, then भू, ल् also should become expressive. If it is accepted that cognition lies in समभिव्याहार पूर्वपदी भावापन्न परिनिष्ठित समुदाय घटक यावद्वर्ण उच्चारणं then वाचकत्वशक्ति also exists in that, otherwise it leads to गौरव.

(3) In the form भव् + अ + ति which is a परिनिष्ठित प्रयोग, as there is no विनिगमक to say that the letters convey meaning, only usage holds good. विनिगमक means - द्वयोः पक्षयोः मध्ये एकस्य पक्षस्य साधिका युक्तिः - 'the absence of reason to show the best side of an argument'. Hence प्रकृति - प्रत्ययs are vācakās.

Now by stating, किञ्च he points out one more fault against those who hold that स्थानिs are expressive.

(4) If लकार becomes expressive then, the sense of कृति or भावना for लकार, and the sense 'कृत्याश्रय कर्तृ' for the लकार recalled by शतृ - कृत् प्रत्ययs given by the NKs will not hold good. But लकार has power in कृति only and not in कर्तृ. If ādeśās become expressive then as they are different, tiṅ has power in कृति and कृत् has power in कर्तृ and this fits in to the rule.

When the kṛt suffixes शतृ-शानच् set in the place of लकार, then the meaning of लकार will be कृति. By the rule कर्तरिकृत् (3.4.47). आश्रय is the meaning of शतृ-शानच्. The sense of स्थानि is there for its substitute also - 'यदर्थाभिधान समर्थः स तस्य आदेशः' is the maxim. Even by the rule स्थानेन्तरतमः (1.1.50), the आदेश conveys the sense of the स्थानि. Hence शानच् etc come in the sense of लकार. Here the rule 'कर्तरिकृत्' will not interfere. In पाकः etc as there is the अधिकार of the rule भावे (3.3.18) , the suffix घञ् comes in the sense of भाव.

Though there is no आकांक्षा of another meaning, by the rule 'कर्तरिकृत्' the sense of कर्तृ is conveyed. Based on these faults it is logical to accept that only substitutes are expressive.

देवदत्तः .... उक्तं - In the usage देवदत्तः पचमानः there is अभेदान्वय between the नामार्थ Devadatta and the sense of the शानच् प्रत्ययान्त word पचमानः. This is familiar in usage. Though ल-कार is कृतिवाचक, its substitutes शानच् etc. express the agent. In the school of the NKs, this is an example to show that शानच् etc are कतृवाचकs. Now, Dixita replies by the kārika 'तरबाद्यन्ततिङक्ष्वस्ति....' If the meaning could be determined due to the सामानाधिकरण्य in usage, like देवदत्तः, पचमानः, then even in तिङन्तs which are तद्धितप्रत्ययs like तरप् , कल्पम् etc i.e. in usages like पचतितरां मैत्रं, पचति कल्पं मैत्रः as सामानाधिकरण्य is seen, the sense कर्तृ etc has to be given to तिङ्. In पचतितरां the suffix तरप् has set in, in the sense of अतिशय. The NKs have to say - 'अतिशय विक्लित्यनुकूल कृतिः' and in पचतिकल्पं - as 'कल्पप्' has come in the sense of ईषदसमाप्त the meaning would be 'ईषदसमाप्त विक्लित्यनुकूलकृतिः' But there is no possibility of अभेदान्वय between this meaning and the meaning of मैत्र. The NKs for the sake of अभेदान्वय have to give the sense of कर्तृत्व for tiṅ. As NKs say - 'कृतिः आख्यातार्थः' they do not give the sense of कर्तृ for तिङ्.

In the usage 'पचति कल्पं' etc as सामानाधिकरण्य is there, though कृति is the meaning of लकार, the sense of कर्तृ shall be accepted by लक्षणा. The NKs do not like that. More over, the स्थानिलकार being expressive, as there is no power for the आदेश शानच् it is not possible to state लक्षणा related to the expressed meaning.

If meaning is accepted for the substitute these faults do not occur. If substitutes become expressive, there is opposition from the rule 'लः कर्मणि.' The power of the form of बोधकता is in तिङ् etc. For the sake of लाघव, imagining that लकारs are the sthānis for tiṅ etc. the lakāras convey the meanings kartr, karma and bhāva. Just as in रामान्, रामैः etc, the karma and karaṇa present in न-कार and विसर्ग are traced to शस् and भिस्, similarly it is imagined in लकारs also. This has been clearly explained in dhātvartha nirṇaya. Thus वर्ण-स्फोट of the form of प्रकृति-प्रत्यय present in words has been explained.

पद-स्फोट - अथादेशः .... इति दिक् - The वर्ण -स्फोट of the form of प्रकृति-प्रत्यय existing in साधु शब्दs are shown to be expressive. Now, it will be established that the पदस्फोट of the form of प्रकृति-प्रत्यय समुदाय i.e. the base and the suffix together is expressive or vacāka. The cognition of meaning after each letter is against experience. By 'घ' कार there is no cognition. The word घट makes sense. Moreover, in words like धनं, वनं etc. if meaning is present in every letter, then they get the प्रातिपदिक संज्ञा - the sign of the nominal base and as a result the suffix 'सुप्' has to set in after every letter. Then there is elision for that by the rule सुपोधातुप्रातिपदिकयोः (2.4.71), then as every letter is a पद, जश्त्व and न लोप will set in giving rise to all undesired forms. It may be said that - cognition comes only after uttering the last letter, hence power lies in that. But it is not so. The impression that is created in the mind after hearing every letter, helps in understanding the meaning after uttering the last letter. Hence the earlier letters are not without meaning. By uttering only the last letter also, does not lead to cognition. If the letters have no meaning, then there is no meaning for पद also, which is a group of these letters. This is the view of Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa.

Further, he refutes now those who argue for वर्णस्फोट.

If the impression created by hearing the earlier letters helps in cognition, then, when the sentence रामोऽस्ति has to be uttered, only the word राम is uttered first, after two hours the अकार is uttered. Even then, if the संस्कार is still there, it should lead to cognition. But it does not happen so. Therefore the same order (आनुपूर्वि) रामोऽस्ति is the शक्यतावच्छेदक. इति दिक् means -

Well if the समुदाय has no meaning the प्रातिपादिकसंज्ञा will not come. K.Bh. gives three faults in the view that the last letter alone is expressive.

(1) In घटं पश्य etc. the meaning of the form of घट not being the sense of the base, it is opposed to - प्रकृत्यर्थान्वित स्वार्थबोधकत्वं प्रत्ययानां. The meaning of the suffix. कर्मत्व etc cannot concord with the meaning of घट.

(2) If the प्रातिपदिक sets in after the last letter and it becomes सुबन्त by the rule तदादि-तदन्त, then in sentences like घटः अस्ति, as समुदाय is not a पद, the निघातस्वर will not come by the rule तिङऽतिङः (8.1.28)

(3) If only the last letter is considered expressive then the classification of words like रूढ (गौः), यौगिक (पाचकः), योगरूढ (पंकजः) and यौगिकरूढ (अश्वकर्णः) cannot be established. The word गौः is

familiar in the sense of गोत्व जाति विशिष्ट गो. The word पंकज being योगरूढ gives the रूढ्यर्थ, namely कमल along with its अवयवार्थ viz. पङ्कज. In घट-पट etc, समुदाय is पद not वर्ण. ‘पदे वर्णाः’ is the usage. Thus ‘वर्णसमुदाय’ being expressive ‘पदस्फोट’ is established.

सुप्तिङन्तं पदं .... इत्यर्थः - Now K.Bh. establishes the theory of अखण्डपदस्फोट. In usages like घटेन इति, in घटेन etc घटे is प्रकृति- base. न is प्रत्यय suffix. If the division is done like घट्-एन then it does not help to gain the correct knowledge. The rule आद्गुणः (6.1.87) states घट + इन has to be used like घटेन. The change takes place in the mind. Hence, in the whole substitute घटेन, as प्रकृति-प्रत्यय are not seen separately the अखण्ड (whole) सुबन्त is वाचक or expressive. By this अखण्डपदस्फोट is established. For this the bhāṣya -

“सर्वे सर्वपदादेशाः दाक्षीपुत्रस्य पाणिनेः ।
एकदेश विकारे हि नित्यत्वं नोपपद्यते ॥ (M.Bh.)

under the rule ‘युष्मदस्मद्भ्यां ङसोस् (7.1.27) gives the proof. Even for grammarians who state that शब्द is eternal and unchangeable, the division of प्रकृति-प्रत्यय is not possible. This has been stated in the kārikā ‘वस्नसादाविव’ on the pretext of giving an example. व्याज means - ‘अन्यप्रदर्शनेन अन्यगतधर्मस्य अन्यत्र बोधनं व्याजः’ . To state that the property present in the example is present in the object under discussion is vyāja. As the substitutes वस्, नस् is ordained for the plurals युष्माकं, अस्माकं there is no possibility of division in वः, नः etc. In fact like घटेन, the दृष्टन्त, वः नः is present in the पक्ष itself. दृष्टान्त should be outside पक्ष-संदिग्धसाध्यवान् पक्षः दृष्टान्त should be निश्चितसाध्य.

In वः, नः as division is an impossibility, though it is पक्षान्तर्गत, it is given as दृष्टान्त and stated as दृष्टान्तव्याज.

वाक्यस्फोट निरूपणम् -

सुप्तिङन्तं .... इति बोध्यं - Vākya is of three kinds as सुबन्तचय, तिङन्त चय and सुबन्त तिङन्त चय. रामेण गन्तव्यम्, पचति भवति (पाको भवति) and देवदत्तः पचति are the examples respectively.

In the usage 'हरेऽव', 'विष्णोऽव,' पूर्वरूप एकादेश has set in by the rule एङः पदान्तादति (6.1.109). But the division हरे-अव, विष्णो-अव is not very clear. Still cognition comes from समुदाय. Hence power has to be created in सुबन्त and तिङन्त.

वस्तुतः - Actually, meaning is conveyed by a sentence, like the way it is conveyed by a word. Hence power in वाक्यार्थशक्ति has to accepted. Just as meaning is expressed by घटः, संसर्गार्थ is expressed by vākya. As, meanings for words are available by words themselves, by the rule अनन्यलभ्यः शब्दार्थः, for a sentence power is in संसर्ग alone.

By the word व्यवस्थितौ used by Kaunda Bhaṭṭa, both पदस्फोट and वाक्यस्फोट have been established. As cognition comes by वाक्यस्फोट there is no need for पदस्फोट. वाक्यस्फोट alone remains as a doctrine.

If power is not accepted in vākya, then by the sentence घटः कर्मत्वं आनयनं कृतिः , even for a person without शक्तिज्ञान about this sentence that it means घटकर्मक आनयनजनक कृतिविषयक बोधः' there is that cognition. If power is accepted in the above sentence, as the power responsible for the above cognition is not there, it will not result in that cognition. Along with वक्तृतात्पर्य or the intention of the speaker, there is the need for another reason. By 'घटमानय' the cognition should be 'घटकर्मकं आनयनं'. Therefore बोध or cognition is the effect. A knowledge of the प्रातिपदिक घट, the case which shows कर्मत्व, then the verbal root and आख्यात् or तिङ् after it and the knowledge of their समभिव्याहाररूप आकांक्षा is the cause for knowledge. This is the cause for शाब्दबोध. Hence, it is said that there is no need for वाक्यस्फोट. But वाक्यशक्ति is the cause for the cognition present in आकांक्षा. Between आकांक्षाज्ञान and वाक्यशक्तिज्ञान the difference is only in name. If वाक्य is वाचक or expressive, the व्यङ्ग्य or the suggestive meaning is 'vākya sphoṭa'.

Objection - पदार्थोपस्थिति is the cause for the शाब्दबोध. For पदार्थोपस्थिति the knowledge of power is the cause, power is in the word, not vākya. Hence पदशक्ति alone is presented in the lexicon. Vākya Śakti, without conveying the meaning of words shows संसर्ग or connection only.

Reply - The knowledge of the बोधजनकत्वरूपशक्ति in the word घट is the cause by अन्वयव्यतिरेक for the effect 'घटत्वविशिष्ट घट विषयक बोधः'. Thus the power in word is established. Similarly, the knowledge of the वाक्यशक्ति is the cause by अन्वयव्यतिरेक for the effect, विशेष्य-विशेषण भाव रूप संसर्ग विषयबोध present in words. Thus power in vākya has to be accepted. 'समभिव्याह्रियन्ते - पौर्वापर्यविशेषानि क्रियन्ते पदानि अस्मिन् इति समभिव्याहारः. समुदाय means the sentence having a group of words. The knowledge of the power in the sentence is बोधकता is also the cause for verbal knowledge.

Objection - Though बोधजनकत्व is present in the vākya it is not power. शक्ति is the cause for पदार्थोपस्थिति which leads to शाब्दबोध. That power is in the word, not in the sentence.

Ṛeply - शक्ति is the बोधजनकत्व - the property of generating cognition present in the word due to संसर्ग. This is the meaning of अर्थोपस्थापक. In the case of words this is of two kinds -

(1) The knowledge that the word घट conveys the विशेष्य, the individual and the adjective genus.

(2) The वाक्यविशेष्यकज्ञान that the sentence घटमानय is responsible for the cognition 'घटकर्मकं आनयनं'.

Word is the cause for पदविशेष्यकज्ञान. The Śabda of the form of vākya is the cause for वाक्यविशेष्यकज्ञान. There is बोधजनकत्वरूपशक्ति in both. The power responsible for the cognition through संसर्ग is in vākya. The power responsible for 'प्रकाराश्रय' and 'विशेष्याश्रय विषयबोध' is in word. It is brief to create power in vākya for cognition. If संसर्ग has to be established by vākya in the शाब्दबोध, power has to be accepted for vākya in vākyārtha. When the sentence becomes refined by śāstra(वाक्यावधिकान्वाख्यान), there is cognition by sentence itself. This is वाक्यस्फोट and not पदस्फोट. This is made clear in the bhāṣya under the rule 'ढः सिधुट्' (8.3.29). There is more information even in भूषण.

Objection - As संसर्ग is the subject for वाक्यार्थ, in general, there is no knowledge of power in vākya before शाब्दबोध.

Reply - As संसर्ग is not seen before the cognition of वाक्यार्थ,

the 'संसर्ग निरूपित शक्तिरूप सम्बन्धज्ञान' is not there in the vākya. The same is the case with पद also. According to the maxim 'यत्र उभयोः समो दोषः परिहारः तयोः समः' - some common solution has to be stated.

Those who state that word conveys संसर्ग through लक्षण and power lies in the word for concordance also, even for them, as there is no knowledge of connection (संसर्ग) before शब्दबोध, what is the solution ? For the cognition of relation among words if शक्ति or लक्षण is accepted that becomes वृत्तिज्ञान in words.

Even according to the view that वाक्यार्थ is संसर्ग, power in vākya may be stated similar to पद stated above.

Even for a person who is not aware that there is a river by name 'हरिद्रा' after hearing the sentence 'हरिद्रायां नद्यां घोषः' by the word नदी, he can grasp by power that हरिद्रा is the name of the river and on its bank lies a village. Hence there is no obstacle in recognizing power in a vākya.

By the respective vrittis in words, the meaning of a word is conveyed. This knowledge of the meaning of a word is referred to as 'उपस्थिति'. The knowledge of the meanings of all words lead to verbal knowledge or शाब्दबोध. By the word घटः, घट conveys the individual and the first case shows the singular number. एकत्व by intimate relation exists in घट as adjective. समवाय सम्बन्धेन एकत्ववान् घटः is the शाब्दबोध.

In 'गामानय' the word गां conveys a cow with relation. The word आनय conveys सम्बन्ध विशिष्ट आनयन क्रिया. By the case termination 'अम्' etc the knowledge of the special relation कर्मत्व

etc comes - गोकर्मकं आनयनं. The followers of the Mīmāmsā school of Prabhākara state शक्ति in सम्बन्ध. This is called 'अन्विताभिधान'.

In घटमानय the word घट is शक्त in अन्वितघट. The word आनय is in अन्वितानयन. Here if it is accepted that agreement shows general relation, then as the meaning of the word is of many kinds like आनयन, दर्शन, गमन etc the relation also is of many kinds like निरूपकता, स्वरूप, आश्रयता etc, Hence infinite powers have to be created. Thus they accept that power exists in the word घट, which concords by general relation. By परस्पर तात्पर्य and आकांक्षा special relations are also conveyed. Just as the समवायरूपसम्बन्धविशेष is seen between घटत्व and घट, similarly, the power in vākya indicated by vākyartha, after having conveyed general relation by आकांक्षा shows special relations also. Thus both views are similar.

Thus according to grammarians, if power is there in word, in the same way power exists in vakya. This alone is stated by Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa as तद्ग्रहासम्भवः तुल्यः

Though power indicated by agreement (अन्वयांशनिरूपित शक्ति) is of no use for cognition, there is the knowledge of words which help शाब्दबोध. In this situation, if the theory 'कुब्जशक्तिवाद' is accepted, even in vākya the unknown power helps शाब्दबोध. कुब्जशक्तिवाद means -

'Though a deformed man cannot function in the normal way, he is capable of seeing etc. with his eyes etc. which are intact'. But this becomes 'अभ्योपगम'. It means 'सदसद् विवेकेन स्वीकारः'. Therefore, the unknown power is not helpful in cognition. Moreover, there is no proof for कुब्जशक्तिवाद.

Now, he gives another solution. When there are three persons like आज्ञापकवृद्ध, आज्ञाप्यवृद्ध and बाल if the आज्ञापकवृद्ध says 'गामानय' then the आज्ञाप्यवृद्ध (the man to whom the command is given) brings the cow, the boy who watches this understands in his mind that the sentence गामानय has power in the sense - 'गोकर्मक आनयन'. Then by the usages 'पटमानय' घटं नय, etc by 'आवाप' and 'उद्वाप' i.e. the removal of one word (प्रक्षेप) and insertion (निक्षेप) of another word gains the knowledge of शक्ति in words. Here the special relation is cognised mentally. Similarly, knowledge of power in वाक्यार्थ also takes place mentally.

Now, he explains the method of स्फोट, which is accepted by grammarians.

In 'गामानय', the word आनय conveys 'आनयनत्व' then by लक्षणा conveys the person who brings (आनयनव्यक्ति). Even the word गो conveys through its own meaning the act of bringing by लक्षणा.

According to grammarians - in 'गंभीरायां नद्यां' it is not correct to take the help of लक्षणा for both the words. If लक्षणा is given as नदीतीर for नदी, it does not agree with the word गभीर. Because तीर 'bank' is not गभीर (deep). गभीरत्व is the property of the river. It is by लक्षणा the meaning गभीर तीर is given to गभीर, then it would be गभीर तीरे नद्यां. गभीरतीर is not the river. तीर is not गभीर. Thus the intended meaning of the vākya is not conveyed.

Supposing, if it is said that one of them is लाक्षणिक and the other is तात्पर्यग्राहक, then also it is not correct. Because it is not clear as to which word should have which kind of meaning.

Therefore, लक्षणा has to be defined as - 'स्वबोध्य संबन्धो लक्षणा'. Then the meaning conveyed by the whole phrase 'गभीरायां नद्यां' as गभीराभिन्ना नदी has to get the secondary meaning - 'गभीराभिन्ननदीतीर'. As there is no power in the whole word 'गभीरायां नद्यां' there is not शक्यार्थ or expressed meaning for this. But there is cognition from the whole phrase. By the word स्व in लक्षणा, the two words 'गभीरायां नद्यां' have to be taken. There is contact of तीर with the meaning 'गभीर रूप नदी' conveyed by them. Similarly, the MKs call लक्षणा for वाक्य in वाक्यार्थसंसर्ग. Just like the way there is cognition of वाक्यार्थ in the school of MKs, their followers and some vedantis, in the say way वाक्यरूपस्फोट gets established for grammarians.

Objection - According to the view of those who consider वर्ण as अनित्य, letters are created and get destroyed. According to those who consider वर्ण as नित्य, their अभिव्यक्ति - showing off being transitory, and as all the letters are not seen simultaneously there is no knowledge of all the letters at the same time.

Reply - In the following moment by अव्यवहितोत्तर संबन्ध (un interrupted relation) in the later letter, the property of the पूर्ववर्ण is present. This continues letter after letter. Thus, even the word घट and the sentence घटं आनय get established. When the knowledge of the earlier letter is present, the later letter appears. Thus अव्यवहितत्व - continuity is established till the last letter.

As the continuity is established, as stated above, the property of the earlier letter is present by अव्यवहितोत्तरत्व संबन्ध in the later letter. The presence of घकार विशिष्ट अकारवत्व is in ट-कार. In this order, with the perception of the existing last letter and the non-existing earlier letters, the perception of word and sentence is easy. Hence, the knowledge of power indicated by meaning is gained in pada and vākya. As the letters show themselves in this order, words comprising of letters, and sentences comprising of words are seen. Thus 'पदस्फोट' and 'वाक्यस्फोट' are established.

सखण्डस्फोट - Having explained अखण्डस्फोट (पदवाक्ययोरखण्डत्वम्), K.Bh., now takes up सखण्डस्फोट as इदानीं .... प्रतिपादितम्. First he sums up अखण्डस्फोट - अवयव अघटितत्वम् अखण्डत्वम् - i.e. without any parts. प्रकृति-प्रत्ययs form वर्णस्फोट. In पचति etc there are no varnas. Hence वर्णसमूह is not पद. For this he gives the example वर्णेष्ववयवा इव. When there is the approval of both वादि and प्रतिवादि those who argue for and against concur, it becomes a दृष्टान्त - दृष्टः अन्तः निश्चयः । As no कार्य or effect is seen any where due to the parts in varṇas like एकार, ओकार, ऋकार etc it is given as दृष्टान्त. To convey that there are no parts even in varṇas, the word 'व्याज' is used. व्याज means 'अन्योद्देशेन अन्यसाधनः'. There are no parts even in प्रकृति-पत्यय वर्णस्फोट. To convey that it is अखण्ड, the phrase 'वर्णेष्ववयवा न च' is used by Dixita in the kārikā. In some books the reading is 'इव'. Just as the रेफ etc in ऋकार etc are not accepted as natural रेफs, similarly letters in words and words in sentences are not accepted in principle.

After the root 'विच्' (विचिर् पृथग्भावे) having the sense of 'पृथग्भाव', the suffix घञ् sets in gives the form विवेकः. That is पृथग्भाव gives the sense of भेद. 'प्र' gives the sense of 'अत्यन्त' But, K.Bh. clearly says 'भेदो नास्ति' though पद-वाक्य are seen as they are अखण्ड, there is no भेद.

K.Bh. explains further as - पद-वाक्य s are not वर्णसमूहs, they are one and partless. There is no proof in creating infinite varnas. It is not right to say that the difference seen as क-कार, ग-कार etc is only the proof. The letters are created due to the contact of wind with their respective places of origin. like throat, palate etc. In the उत्पत्ति पक्ष it is वर्णजनकता and in the अभिव्यक्ति पक्ष it is व्यञ्जकता. As the difference (वैजात्य) in them is imposed, by intimate relation in स्फोट, the different sounds like क-कार, ग-कार are heard. विभिन्ना जातिः-धर्मः यस्य सः विजातिः - पदार्थः विजातेः भावः - वैजात्यं असाधारणधर्मः। - In the वायुसंयोग, अत्व, कत्व etc. become special properties. Thus, the sphoṭa by the imposed कत्व, गत्व etc. conveys the knowledge of क, ग, etc. and not different letters like क, ग etc. It is not right to say that the usage 'उत्पन्नः गकारः' shows that the sphoṭa कत्व-गत्व etc. is अनित्य. Because in the same, the knowledge 'सोऽयं ककारः' is conveyed. Hence, the idea of 'उत्पन्नः' etc is considered as an illusion. In this way, the special properties like कत्व,खत्व etc due to the contact of the wind are imposed on sphoṭa by intimate relation. Hence, there are no varṇas other than sphoṭa.

This aspect of आरोप is made very clear in 'भामती' a commentary on Shānkara Bhāṣya by Vācaspatimiśra.

In the देवताधिकरण, while deciding about the अधिकार of Gods in Yagña etc.

'भामती' writes 'तारत्वादि वायुनिष्ठं वर्णेषु आरोप्यते'. तारत्व means उच्चैस्त्व. अधिकरण means 'विषयो संषयश्चैव पूर्वपक्षस्ततोत्तरं निर्णयश्चेति पञ्चाङ्गं शास्त्रेऽधिकरणं स्मृतम्'.

Objection - According to the maxim 'तद्धेतोरेव तत्त्वे किं तेन' it is brief to say that the कत्व, गत्व etc due to contact of wind are expressive. There is no need for आरोप.

Reply - The श्रावणरूप प्रत्यक्ष is accepted by the usage पदं वाक्यं वा श्रृणोमि. वायुसंयोग being अतीन्द्रिय cannot be brought under perception. It is not right to say that कत्व etc present in वायुसंयोग even when imposed on स्फोट, cannot be heard (no श्रावणप्रत्यक्ष). Because, in the statement 'सुरभिचन्दनं' - Sandal is fragrant' though 'fragrance' is not the subject for चाक्षुषप्रत्यक्ष, but through ज्ञानलक्षणा प्रत्यासत्ति becomes the subject for perception. Similarly the व्यञ्जक properties कत्व etc become the subject for श्रावणप्रत्यक्ष. Thus the sphota from कत्व etc becomes expressive.

As वर्णs, पद and वाक्य do not exist at the same time they cannot become expressive. If वर्णs become nitya, then there is no प्रत्यभिज्ञा. Ekatva cannot be present in पद-वाक्य. But there is प्रत्यभिज्ञा like तदेवेदं पदम् , तदेवेदं वाक्यम् , सोऽयं गकारः etc. Therefore sphoṭa has to be created, which is nitya and akhanda. There is no choice. वाचकत्व has to be stated. Thus अखण्डस्फोट gets established.

The order of स्फोटसाधनक्रम by Kaiyaṭa is explained earlier. वर्ण or वर्णसमूह is not वाचक. Therefore, the अखण्ड or the partless नाद, from the letters flashes sphoṭa. This becomes expressive is the view of Kaiyaṭa.

But Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa condemns this by saying 'तत्तुच्छं...' - According to Kaiyaṭa - sphota is what flashes by the letters involved in dhwani. Then it leads to the doubt, whether every letter is suggestive or the group of letters. If every letter is suggestive then, as soon as a letter is uttered, the meaning is conveyed and so the remaining letters become useless. Hence, Kaiyaṭa's view is not acceptable to K.Bh.

But some support Kaityaṭa's view and accept अखण्डस्फोट as expressive.

Objection - In the school of grammarians, is every letter suggestive or group of letters ? Is the contact of air responsible fore every letter expressive ? or do all of them together become expressive ?

Reply - The wind that proceeds from the navel creates contact gradually. Hence, combined contact of the wind being impossible, every contact is suggestive. Though every contact is suggestive in गौः, one contact as गत्व, another as औत्व, the next as विसर्गत्व flash sphoṭa in many forms. Like this only one sphoṭa shows itself in different forms. But it (भिन्नरूप) is imposed and not real. Therefore varṇas are not different from sphoṭa. That is, the sphoṭa conveyed by गत्व etc and गत्वादिविशिष्ट संयोग are not different.

Objection - The contacts by wind which flash सत्व etc being the same, there should be meaning also.

Reply - Due to difference in उपाधि, there is difference between घ and ट. This difference creates difference in sphoṭa also. In सरः सवत्व in रेफ and सविशिष्ट रवत्व in visarga is imagined. In रसः, रवत्व in सकार, र-विशिष्ट सवत्व in विसर्ग is imagined. Thus in सरः-रसः - different meaning are conveyed.

In this way, due to continuous relation with the coming letters, as घविशिष्ट ट-वत्व exists in the visarga, the knowledge of the word घटः is conveyed and that word will be responsible for the meaning.

Objection - According to grammarians, घ etc are eternal, being sphota. After the destruction of the first letter, the second letter is created is the view of the bhāṣya stated under the rule 'परः सन्निकर्षः संहिता'.

The time which is the substratum for the destruction of the first letter also creates अव्यवहितोत्तरत्व. As the relation between this and नित्य टकार is impossible, how can घवत्व be present in ट-कार by that relation ?

Reply - Here one has to accept 'स्वज्ञान अधिकरण क्षणोत्पत्तिकज्ञान विषयत्वरूप अव्यवहितोत्तरत्व - The knowledge of sphoṭa from घत्व etc exists in the first moment and second moment and gets destroyed in the third moment. This is the mode of knowledge. As sphoṭa is eternal it does not get destroyed, hence it has the adjective प्रज्ञान in the second moment. According to this order, the अव्यवहितोत्तर of the form of knowledge of घ being present in ट, the knowlege of the word becomes the cause for the knowledge of the meaning. Though Varṇa is nitya, its अभिव्यक्ति being अनित्य, the अव्यवहितोत्तरत्व created during the time which is the substratum for घ-विषयक अभिव्यक्ति being present in ट-वर्ण, the knowledge of the word is established. This is called 'आनुपूर्वि'. There is no वर्ण other than sphoṭa. This is the view of K.Bh. By the varna present in dhvani sphoṭa is seen. The varṇa beyond sphoṭa being perishable there is no वर्णसमूह. Therefore there is no word and no sentence. Due to the अनुपपत्ति of वाचकत्व sphoṭa gets established.

By एतेन .... अप्राप्तं - he refutes the view of परिमलाचार्य. The question is, whether the अखण्ड sphota, in synonyms, is one or many ?

The grammarians say that in synonyms, the difference in power by शक्ततावच्छेदकभेद being reasonable, different powers for synonyms are acceptable. The कत्व etc due to वायुसंयोग is imposed on sphota. Hence, the स्फोट, with the imposed कत्व etc is alone varna and also synonym. The औपाधिकभेद is seen in synonyms. Actually, there is no difference in sphoṭa by varṇa and पर्याय. By अव्यवहितोत्तर relation, प्रथमवर्णविशिष्ट द्वितीयवर्णविशिष्ट तृतीयवर्णत्व is present in the fourth letter. Thus by the श्रावणप्रत्यक्ष of the last letter the knowledge of the earlier varṇas comes through 'ज्ञानलक्षणा प्रत्यासत्ति'. As varṇas are nitya there is the usage - 'सोऽयं ककारः, तदेवेदं पदं, तदेवेदं वाक्यं, thus he says दिक्.

नन्वेवं .... गृह्यते - If अखण्डस्फोट alone is वाचक then the analysis of words into प्रकृति प्रत्यय etc becomes useless.

Dīxita replies by the kārikā पञ्चकोशादिवत्. Just like the creation of the non-existing पञ्चकोशs, even the प्रकृति-प्रत्ययs which are not real is created to convey the real sphoṭa.

पञ्चकोश appears in the भृगुवल्ली of Taittirīyopaniṣad. Here the पञ्चकोशs such as अन्न, प्राण, मनस्, विज्ञान and आनन्द are the means to know Brahman. They are not the real Brahman. Similarly to convey वाचकत्व in sphoṭa, all these are accepted - 'उपायाः अव्यवस्थिताः'.

Further he gives two examples to show वैजात्य or असाधारणधर्म

in accepting the above explanation. The use of mantras in हविर्दान leads to 'वैजात्य' special property. Even the ब्रह्मज्ञान which comes from Vedānta, is वैजात्य विशिष्ट ब्रह्मज्ञान and not merely ब्रह्मज्ञान. But those who are interested in पुरुषार्थ will not indulge in sphoṭa. For this, K.Bh, replieṣ -

The knowledge of shpoṭa is also the cause for attaining heaven. This is explained in the bhāṣya that - 'एकः शब्दः सम्यक् ज्ञातः, सुष्ठु प्रयुक्तः स्वर्गे लोके कामधुक् भवति, and by tradition it is also the cause for मोक्ष or salvation. ज्ञान leads to आत्मज्ञान which leads to मोक्ष 'त्तमेव विदित्वा अति मृत्युमेति'. Again - 'महता देवेन नः साम्यं यथा स्यात् इति अध्येयं व्याकरणं' (M.Bh.). Even Bhartrhari has confirmed this view. अपशब्दप्रयोग creates obstacles in yagas. Hence grammar helps to overcome this. वाङ्गल means, the defects in स्वर, व्यञ्जन or अपभ्रंशs. As it illuminates शब्दब्रह्म, it is the most sacred science.

It is useful for the study of all sciences. He, who has no illusion about sphoṭa, understands परावाक् easily. Hence, the knowledge of sphoṭa is the highway for attaining salvation.

Objection - If the creation of प्रकृति - प्रत्यय is not real, then there is no knowledge of real sphoṭa.

Reply - The division of प्रकृति-प्रत्यय is not an absolute unreality like शशश्रृङ्ग - the horn of a hare. It is illusory like the पञ्चकोशs. It is neither सत् nor असत् but विलक्षण. This may be explained by the word 'अनर्वचनीय'. Dixita explains this later in the kārikā अनेकव्यक्ति अभिव्यङ्ग्य etc. By the word आदि in पञ्चकोशादिवत्, the maxim रेखागवयन्यात्य may be taken. How by the form of the unreal गवय

drawn by lines, a real gavaya is cognised, similarly by the unreal प्रकृति-प्रत्ययs the knowledge of real sphoṭa is acquired.

ननु ...... भावः - स्फोट, वर्ण and वर्णजाति are eternal. Then there cannot be the usage 'ककारः उत्पन्नः'. The genus कत्व etc present in वायुसंयोग is seen as it is imposed on sphoṭa. Though it is stated that कत्व, गत्व etc exist in the व्यञ्जकवायुसंयोग - the contact of the wind which is suggestive, कत्व is seen in the sphoṭa where कत्व is not there. Hence ककारः, गकारः etc have to become an illusion. The next kārikā answers this doubt.

कल्पितानां .... - The special properties कत्व, गत्व etc are present in 'वायुसंयोग by intimate relation, still, by स्वाश्रयाभिव्यङ्ग्यत्वसम्बन्ध i.e. स्व-कत्व etc. become responsible for कत्वादि प्रकारक प्रतीति in the sphoṭa that flashes. As this relation exists at the time of the contact of the wind, and as this वायुसंयोग is अनित्य, the statement ककारः उत्पन्नः becomes relevant. The properties कत्व etc present in वायुसंयोग may be heard by 'स्वासमवेताभिव्यञ्जकसमवेतत्व सम्बन्ध. स्व means the organ of hearing, sphoṭa is present in it by intimate relation, it is the contact of the wind that flashes sphoṭa and कत्व etc are present in the वायुसंयोग by intimate relation.

Now, he gives the view of the MKs. Whatever is imagined could become उपाधि. The varṇas अकार etc with the eternal एकत्वसंख्या are different due to the properties उदात्तत्त्व etc imposed on them. Though the Vedāntins also say so, yet for them everything other than Brahman being अनित्य, they accept नित्यत्व in letters which originates at the time of creation and perishes during deluge.

The MKs accept the उदात्तत्त्व, दीर्घत्व etc present in dhvani which is different from varṇa by imposing on the varṇas which are eternal. While the vaīyakaraṇas accept that the creation and destruction of कत्व etc present in the वायुसंयोग or the contact of wind, are imposed on the sphoṭa, which is eternal, one and of the form of Brahman. Thus there is no irrelevance in the theory of sphoṭa.

Now K.Bh explains the view of the MKs - In the varṇas अकार etc as एकत्व and नित्यत्व exist, the other properties like उदात्तत्व etc cannot be present. The properties एकत्व, नित्यत्व etc in varṇas are known by the प्रत्यभिज्ञान - 'स एव अयं', 'तत्र इदंतावगाहि, संस्कारेन्द्रिय सन्निकर्ष उभयजन्यं वा-प्रत्यभिज्ञानं, या व्यक्तिः पूर्वं अनुभूता सैव व्यक्तिः पुनः प्रत्यक्षविषयीभूताचेत्, तदा, प्रत्यभिज्ञान शब्देन व्यवह्रियते, यथा - 'सोऽयं अकारः, सोऽयं चैत्रः, etc. In 'सोऽयं गकारः' though this ग-कार is different from the earlier one as the गत्वरूपप्रतियोगितावच्छेदक is present in ग-कार, though there is वृत्तिभेद, there is no opposition for the प्रत्यभिज्ञा 'सोयं गकारः' The statement that 'the varṇa is created' is not there. But the usage the varṇa is pronounced' exists. 'उच्चारण' is nothing but 'प्रयत्न विशेष.' 'नित्य' means उच्चरितत्वं 'तालु ओष्ठ संयोगादिजन्य अभिव्यक्ति विशिष्टत्व'. उच्चार is the subject for the अभिव्यक्ति due to the contact with तालु, ओष्ठ etc.

Objection - According to those who consider that शब्द is अनित्य, there is the usage उत्पद्यते वर्णः, वर्णं उत्पादयति etc.

Reply - There is nothing like 'produced and destroyed', in the case of varṇa. But there is 'उत्पत्ति-विनाश' in वर्णव्यञ्जकध्वनि. The creation in this dhvani is by the relation - 'स्वाश्रयध्वनिव्यङ्ग्यत्व' - (स्वः

उत्पत्तिः). विनाश is स्वप्रतियोगिध्वनिव्यङ्ग्यत्वं (स्वः नाशः तत्प्रतियोगी ध्वनिः), which exists by परम्परा in eternal varṇas. The statements 'उत्पन्नः वर्णः, विनिष्टः वर्णः etc are not proofs to say that varṇas are अनित्य. The MKs who say that varṇas are नित्य. don't accept sphoṭa. Sphoṭa is not the meaning of अतिरिक्तवर्ण. It should be called अनित्यवर्ण.

The knowledge that रक्तः स्फटिकः seen in the sphaṭika due to the redness of the japākusuma, by स्वाश्रयसंयोगसंबन्ध is not considered an illusion. In the case of varṇas also it is not an illusion. When reaslied by परम्परासम्बन्ध, it may not be भ्रमा, but as उत्पत्ति-विनाश do not exist in eternal varṇas by direct relation, is it not भ्रम ?

MKs reply - According to the school of nyāya, varṇa is अनित्य. Though there is difference between the letters uttered earlier and later, the non differential knowledge comes as - सोऽयं गकारः. Here, similar to the illusion of MKs in the अभेद of the two, the concept of creation and destruction by direct relation in नित्यवर्णs is also an illusion for us. The fault being the same, it has to be ignored.

Further the MKs say that - varṇa being नित्य, for them there is one ककार, गकार etc, where as if varṇa is अनित्य there are infinite number of them, and their प्रागभाव and ध्वंस have to be accepted. This leads to गौरव.

Regarding ध्वनि or sound in varṇa, it is said that वायुसंयोग or contact of wind being present in the place where the वर्ण is revealed, due to वायुकण्ठसंयोग, there is dhvani in all these places.

Thus, एकत्व and नित्यत्व in varnas have been established.

Hence, according to MKs even उदात्तत्व, अनुदात्तत्त्व, ह्रस्वत्व, दीर्घत्व etc are not present in नित्यवर्णs. They are the properties present in dhvani. But they are seen in varṇa by special relations. This is the same case with the theory of sphoṭa by the grammarians. If अखण्ड sphota is accepted there is no problem. The author called this as 'प्रतिबन्दी' reply. When similar reply is given for the doubts raised by both parties, then it becomes 'प्रतिबन्दी'. After the root - प्रतिपूर्वक, वदि-अभिवादन-स्तुत्योः' if ङीप् and the suffix औणादिक इन् sets in, it becomes प्रतिबन्दी.

Thus five kinds of vyaktisphoṭa like - (१) वर्णस्फोट (२) सखण्डपदस्फोट (३) सखण्डवाक्यस्फोट (४) अखण्डपदस्फोट (५) अखण्डवाक्यस्फोट have been explained so far.

End of the chapter on Sphoṭa theory.

अथ जाति स्फोटः

Jāti-sphoṭa

According to this view, the genus present in घट etc are expressive. The individual who is the substratum of genus is not expressive. Otherwise, infinite sphoṭas become वाचकs which leads to गौरव. In jātisphoṭa as genus is one, sphoṭa is also one. Hence there is no defect. Though there is भेद in sphoṭa due to difference in genus like घटत्व, पटत्व etc of from, there is no difference due to the individual.

The NKs state the genus in sphoṭa as आनुपूर्वी. शक्य means sense. Just as genus in meaning is accepted due to brevity, similarly even in शब्द, if genus is accepted as शक्त, it leads to brevity. Though shpoṭa is one, due to the उपाधि in the form of genus difference is seen.

As sphoṭa is of the form of Brahman, it is without any property. There are no varṇas or वर्णसमूहपदs other than sphoṭa. As the word itself does not exist the discussion whether the genus in its is expressive or not,. is similar to the maxim - 'काकस्य कति वा दन्ताः?'

For this K.Bh. replies - The Varṇas घ etc having the property घत्व etc have to accepted. Otherwise, गकार and हकार become one just like the statement 'सोऽयं गकारः' there will be statements like - 'योऽयं गकारः श्रुतः, सोऽयं हकारः'. By the maxim -

'तदभिंन्नाभिन्नस्य तदभिन्नत्वम्' sphoṭa is not different from घ-कार

and हकार is not different from sphoṭa. Sphoṭa being one, ग-कार रूपस्फोट is the same as ह-कार रूपस्फोट. The cognition that this is ग-कार and not ह-कार will not come.

Though वर्णात्मक स्फोट is one, by imposing different properties like कत्व, घत्व etc, difference is seen and thus the above fault will not occur.

By किञ्च he states that - should घत्व etc. in the form of उपाधि be accepted or not ?

(1) Let un-imposed (अनारोपित घत्व) घत्व alone be घ-कार. घत्व is genus and not varṇa. Hence it is not right to say so.

In that case, the MKs who say that वर्ण is नित्य, accept identify for घत्व-धकार (धर्म-धर्मि), but will not accept varṇa other than घत्व. Hence, let घत्व be घकार is not wrong. Thus, गत्व becomes गकार and leads to the knowledge of गकार etc. To imagine this अतिरिक्तस्फोट leads to prolixity.

(2) But the knowledge of गकार etc comes by imposing the special property in sphoṭa is also not correct - 'तदभाववति तत्प्रकारक ज्ञानं आरेपः'. Hence this knowledge cannot be an illusion. Hence, it is not write to impose.

With a view to create infinite varṇas it is right to accept illusion in the cognition of ग-कार etc. For that purpose K.Bh. says 'अस्तु वा'. Let the contact of the wind be the subject for the cognition ग-कार etc. Hence, there is no need for sphoṭa - वायुसंयोग is beyond the senses and hence an obstacle for the श्रावणप्रत्यक्ष of ग-कार etc. For this, K.Bh. replies by - धर्मवत्. Though wind is अप्रत्यक्ष

(not seen), the touch present in wind is perceptible by the skin. Similarly even ग-कार etc of the form of वायुसंयोग are perceptible by the ear. Thus it is said - 'कृतं स्फोटेन', 'स्फोटेन किञ्चित् साध्यं नास्ति'. As the cognition of the meaning comes from ग-कार of the form of the contact of the wind, it is useless to imagine sphoṭa.

Well, as explained above, Varṇas are perceptible by the ear. But infinite power has to be imagined by the respective varṇas, leading to गौरव. Hence varnas are not expressive. By the maxim - आकृत्यधिकरणन्याय which says genus alone is शब्दवाच्य, genus alone in अर्थ is also वाच्य. Thus the genus present in शब्द is right in being expressive. Sphoṭa alone, which shows as genus is expressive.

Even in 'हरिपद' for the presence of हरि, हरिपदज्ञान as the cause is known. The genus 'पदत्व' is the अवच्छेदक of the अवच्छेदकपद. It is necessary to imagine the special genus.

Objection - To convey genus, the आनुपूर्वी of the letters has to be imagined. In this way, it is not required to say that - the आनुपूर्वी विशिष्टपदज्ञान is the cause, when it is possible to manage by अवश्यक्लृप्त नियतपूर्ववर्तितरूप कारणतावच्छेदकत्व.

Reply - The knowledge of घट comes by the conjunction of its parts and then the घट and the genus कार्यतावच्छेदकघटत्व cannot be established. As this is against perception, it cannot be accepted. Therefore genus alone is expressive. Genus alone by तादात्म्यसम्बन्ध is the अवच्छेदक of वाचकत्व. Thus genus in words is expressive. If genus is शक्त then जातित्व (the property of being genus) becomes शक्ततावच्छेदक (घटत्व). This is present in all घटs and not घट etc. This leads to prolixity. Hence, it is stated as तादात्म्येनावच्छेदिका. तादात्म्य means अभेद (non-difference). Genus is वाचकत्वावच्छेदक present in पदत्वजाति i.e. genus itself is the अवच्छेदक for वाचकत्व present in genus. Hence there is no fault of गौरव.

In 'सरः रसः' there is difference due to उपाधि. उपाधि is आनुपूर्वि (a particular order of letters). And such a word alone can convey genus.

Just as तारत्व and मन्दत्व in sound results due to change in वायुसंयोग and conveys वर्णज्ञानभेद similarly, due to the difference in the suggestive आनुपूर्वि, difference in genus and difference in meaning are achieved.

ननु .... कृतः इति - Then जातिस्फोट which conveys meaning exists in every letter of the word. For this, Dixita replies in the next kārikā

Genus which is conveyed by many letters becomes sphoṭa. The derivation स्फुटति-बोधविषयोभवति अर्थः अस्मात् इति स्फोटः gives the sense that the यौगिकस्फोटपद is the बोधक.

As जातिव्यञ्जकत्व in varnas is not known, and जाति is what is conveyed by many letters. How, is explained in the next kārikā.

Some say that - The individual, the substratum of genus i.e. what shows varṇas alone is dhwani. In the Bhāṣya, in paspashānhika the question - अथ गौरित्यत्र कः शब्दः ? is answered as - प्रतीतपदार्थकः ध्वनिः शब्दः' Further an example is given from Mammaṭa's काव्यप्रकाश.

इदं उत्तमं अतिशायिनिव्यङ्ग्ये वाच्यात् ध्वनिः बुधैः कथितः । While commenting on this poem Mammaṭa says - बुधैः means grammarians. "The वर्णात्मक शब्द is called ध्वनि which flashes the most important स्फोटरूपव्यङ्ग्य.

ननु .... द्रष्टव्यं - Genus is known to be expressive. Moreover it is not useful for the salvation. It is wrong. If not directly, by परम्परा it is useful for पुरुषार्थ.

In every object, there are two parts as सत्य (कालत्रये अबाधितं) and असत्य (कालत्रये बाधितं). Of these what is truth is genus. Individuals are असत्य not true. The Brahman with the individuals is genus. The vedantins also approve of the impossibility of the व्यक्ति वैशिष्ट्य with Brahman. Hence, while commenting on 'द्रव्यं नित्यं', Kaiyaṭa states - असत्योपाधि अविच्छन्नं ब्रह्मतत्त्वं द्रव्यशब्द वाच्यं इत्यर्थः। Again, उपाधि is explained as उप-स्वसमीपवर्तिनि, स्वनिष्ठं धर्मं आदधाति इति उपाधिः - the जपाकुसुम is the उपाधि (condition) as there is the usage 'लोहितः स्फटिकः'. Thus, the individuals being many, related with them, नानात्व is seen is one and only Brahman. The ब्रह्मतत्त्व seen through the unreal उपाधिs, is the expression of द्रव्यवाच्य words घट etc. This is the view of Kaityaṭa.

While commenting on the Bhāṣya at the end of the second chapter - 'चन्द्रतारकवत् प्रतिमण्डितः वेदितव्यः ब्रह्मराशिः' - Kaiyaṭa writes - ब्रह्मतत्वमेव शब्दस्वरूपतया भाति. As there is the Śruti - 'द्वे ब्रह्मणे वेदितव्ये' - The Brahmatattva alone is seen through श्रुत्यात्मक शब्दरूप. (the vedas). For 'आकृतिः अनित्या' in पस्पशाह्निक he writes - 'ब्रह्मदर्शने च गोत्वादि जातेरपि असत्वात् अनित्यत्वं, आत्मैव इदं सर्वं इति श्रुति वचनात्.'

There is पूर्वापरविरोध. Then how is this explained ? For the Bhāṣya - 'आकृतिः नित्या, द्रव्यं अनित्यं, द्रव्यं नित्यं, आकृतिः अनित्या' - by मतभेद both the meanings नित्यत्व-अनित्यत्व are given. Hence, there is not पूर्वापरविरोध. The genus गोत्व etc is the subject of the property created due to avidyā or ignorance.

According to the view that जाति is not ब्रह्मस्वरूप even the statement that - जाति is असत्य appears relevant. The सत्ता in every individual is जाति. उपाधि is जन्य and अनित्य. Being 'अनुपहित' he has stated that it is नित्य

तमेव ..... सुविस्तरं - In the case of a sentence he has stated two kinds of sphoṭa as - अखण्डवाक्यस्फोट and वाक्यजातिस्फोट. In the first by परम्परा, and in the second by direct relation it is the means for salvation. To convey this Dixita writes the last Kārikā. The statements 'अयमात्मा' 'तत्सत्यं' have already been established as 'सत्यं यत् तत्र सा जातिः'.

As stated earlier, as वाचकत्व is अध्यस्त, being separated from प्रकृति etc and hence निरञ्जन (free from any condition) - अञ्जनात् उपाधेः निर्गतं - उपाधिरहितं - and hence अक्षर and अविनाशि ब्रह्म and that alone is शब्दतत्त्व - 'the principle of sound'. Bhartrhari and others say that the शब्दतत्त्व of the form of वाक्यजातिस्फोट is the same as Brahman. The word conveys the form of the sound. According to Śruti 'नामरूपे व्याकरणवाणी' a group of नाम and रूप has been created. Out of these two, like meaning even for the expressive word Brahman is the cause - 'तस्मात् एतस्मात् वा आत्मनः'. This Brahman is

अनादि has no beginning. That is 'प्रागभाव अप्रतियोगित्व' and 'ध्वंस अप्रतियोगित्व'

The word ब्रह्मैव in the kārikā indicates स्वप्रकाशकत्व and परप्रकाशकत्व established by śruti - 'अत्र अयं पुरुषः स्वयं ज्योतिः' 'तमेवभान्तं अनुभाति सर्वम्' 'तस्य भाना सर्वमिदं विभाति', 'नित्यं विज्ञानं आनन्दं ब्रह्म' etc. They lead to the derivation of the word sphoṭa स्फुटति अर्थः अस्मात् इति स्फोटः. The word ब्रह्मैव shows that the words स्फोट and स्वप्रकाश are synonyms.

By explaining the function of उपाधि in वाक्यजातिस्फोट, as शब्दब्रह्म is self-illuminatory, the knowledge of the science of grammar leads to salvation has been established.

To avoid obstacles of any form in the understanding of this doctrine, he uses the word 'पूर्णात्मने' for 'स्तुति' and 'नमः' for 'नति. Thus concludes his work with the मङ्गळ of the form of 'स्तुति - नति, in keeping with the tradition of the M. Bhāṣya 'मङ्गळादीनि, मङ्गळमध्यानि, मङ्गळान्तानि शास्त्राणि प्रथन्ते'.

End of Chapter on Sphoṭa.

Bibilography

1. Amara Simha - Amarakośa - Delhi - 1988
2. Bhartṛhari - Vākyapadīyam, with English translation by Subramanya Iyer, M.B.D. Delhi, 1974-77
3. Gautama - Nyāyasūtra - By Gangānāthajha - India, 1912 - 1919
4. Goerge Cardona - Pāṇini. A Survey of Research, Pub. M.B.D. Delhi. 1976
5. Goldstrucker, Theodor - Pāṇini. Ed. by. S.N. Śāstri, India. 1965
6. Guha D.c. - Navyanyāya system of logic, Calcutta - 1968
7. Īśwarakrishna - Sānkhyākārikā - Pub : M.B.D. - Delhi - 1976
8. Jaimini - Mīmāmsā Sūtras - Pub : M.B.D. Delhi - 1980
9. Kaiyaṭa & Nāgeśa - Mahābhāṣya Pradīpodyota, Varanasi, 1987
10. Kounḍa Bhaṭṭa - Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra - with Harivallabha's Commentary Darpana, C.S. - Varanasi - 1985
11. Kounḍa Bhaṭṭa - Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra - with Bhairavamisra's Commentary pariksa and Harivallabha's commentary Darpana, C.S. Banares City - 1939
12. Kounḍa Bhaṭṭa - Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra - with Gopala Sastry's Commentary Sarala, Banares - 1953
13. Kounḍa Bhaṭṭa - Bṛhadvāiyakaraṇabhūṣaṇam - with manudevacārya's Commentary - Rūpāli, M.B.D. Varanasi - 1985

14. Kumārila - Tantra Vārtika, Poona, 1930

15. Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa - Paramalaghumanjūṣā with the Commentary Bhāvaprakāśikā & Balabodhini - Pub : Krishnadas Academy, Varanasi - 1985

16. Pāṇini - Ashṭādhyāyi (2 vols) with English translation by Vasu S.C., N.B.D. Delhi.

17. Patañjali - Mahābhāṣyam M.B.D Delhi - 1967

18. Perisuryanārāyaṇaśastri - tattvadarśini - A Commentary on Kounḍa Bhaṭṭa's V.Bh. Vizianagarm - 1976

19. Rāmakrishnamācharyulu - Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasārasya Viśiṣṭamadhyayanam, Tirupati - 1981

20. Rāmakrishnamācharyulu - Kounḍa Bhaṭṭa, Tirupati

* * * * *

vishalapt86@yahoo.co.uk

अविकृतयातद्भव
यत्किञ्चित्तद्भव
तद्भव
अर्द्धतद्भव

"सर्वे सर्वपदादेशाः दाक्षीपुत्रस्य पाणिनेः।

"सर्वे सर्वपदादेशाः दाक्षीपुत्रस्य पाणिनेः।
एकदेशविकारे हि नित्यत्वं नोपपद्यते ॥"

Śikṣaṇa Ratna, Vidyāsarasvatī, Dr. Vanitha Ramaswamy is a well known sanskrit scholar who combines traditional learning with modern research. She hails from a family of vedic scholars. She has a master's degree in English and in Sanskrit, winning gold medals. She was awarded the Ph.D. degree by the Pune University for her thesis on 'Pāṇini's grammar and computer'.

In her professional career, she was professor and Head, Dept. of Sanskrit, M.E.S. College, Malleswaram, Bangalore. Several students have obtained Ph.D. degree under her guidance. Presently she is the founder, Director of 'Rasa Centre for Cultural Studies', Bangalore.

She is an international award winner for her research paper on 'knowledge representation in computer'. She has travelled widely and presented papers abroad. She has several publications to her credit. Some have been university text books.

The present book 'Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇa Sāra' is a traditional work of the 16th century on Sanskrit grammar and semantics. The Critical Study in traditional style is based on the Sanskrit Commentaries providing information for a thorough understanding of the text.